Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-188
Thursday
27 September 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-188 *27 September 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Military Analyst Urges Comprehensive Test Ban *[Chernyshev on TASS]* 1
General Views Novaya Zemlya Nuclear Test Plans *[LENIGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Aug]* 1
TASS Reports on U.S. Troop Cuts in Europe 3
Problems Associated With CFE Talks Assessed *[IZVESTIYA 22 Sep]* 3

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Pact Foreign Ministers To Resolve Tanks Issue *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Sep]* 7
Commentary Welcomes End to CEMA Subsidies *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* 7

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Shevardnadze Holds Meetings During UN Visit 9
Talks With Republic Ministers *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Sep]* 9
Holds News Conference 26 Sep *[TASS]* 9
Discusses MBFR With Baker *[TASS]* 10
Concludes Talks With Baker *[TASS]* 11
Opens Talks With EC Ministers *[TASS]* 11
Agrees With Statement on Iraq *[TASS]* 11
Confers With Afghan Minister *[TASS]* 11
TASS Reports on Gerasimov's 26 Sep Briefing 12
Agreement With UN Sanctions 12
Iraq's Nuclear Inspection Stand 12
Mitterrand's Gulf Proposals 13
Expanded NATO Influence 13
Participation in World Bank 13
Publication on Soviet Power 14
Relations With Reunited Germany 14
Bulgarian Premier's Visit 14
Mediterranean Security Meeting 14
Cypriot President's Visit 15
Relations with Singapore 15
Reports on Nuclear Waste Sites 15
Improving Kola Peninsula Ecology 15
Yakovlev Attends Conference on United Germany 16
Addresses Forum in Paris *[TASS]* 16
Discusses Relations With France *[Moscow TV]* 16
Bogachev Questions Continued Need for NATO *[TASS]* 17
Belgium Blocks NATO Air Defense System Plan *[PRAVDA 21 Sep]* 17
NATO Commander Galvin Slated To Visit USSR *[IZVESTIYA 26 Sep]* 18
Soviet Delegates Attend IMF, World Bank Session *[TASS]* 18
Nishanov Meets European Council Delegation *[TASS]* 18
Soviet Academician Attends Pugwash Conference 18
Goldanskiy Outlines Goals *[IZVESTIYA 23 Sep]* 18
Nuclear-Free Zones Supported *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* 19
Mayorov Criticizes Arms Supplies Policies *[Moscow International]* 20
Ambassadors to Cambodia, Ethiopia Replaced *[TASS]* 20
International Journalists Center Set To Open *[IZVESTIYA 21 Sep]* 20

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Pentagon's 1990 Report on Soviet Power Assailed 21
Termed Attempt To Kindle Cold War *[TASS]* 21
Lack of Objectivity Seen *[Moscow International]* 21
U.S. Senate Ratifies Nuclear Test Agreement *[TASS]* 22

Northeast Asia

IZVESTIYA Cited for 'Hindering' of Korean Unity *[Moscow International]* 22
Primakov, Japanese Parliamentarian View Ties *[Moscow International]* 22
Ryzhkov Greets New Mongolian Prime Minister *[IZVESTIYA 22 Sep]* 24

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Singapore Prime Minister Continues Moscow Visit 24
Visit Termed 'Major Milestone' *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 24
Lee Kuan Yew Meets Gorbachev *[TASS]* 25

Near East & South Asia

UN Adopts Resolution on Air Blockade of Iraq *[Kornilov on TASS]* 25
Gulf Crisis Seen To Open New Prospects for Ties *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 26
Talks With PLO Leaders in Moscow Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 27
Palestinian Embassy Responds to Media Criticism *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 28
Situation in United Arab Emirates Examined *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Sep]* 28

East Europe

Bulgaria's Lukanov Continues Soviet Visit 29
Meets With Ryzhkov 25 Sep *[TASS]* 29
Discusses Trade Concerns *[Sofia BTA]* 29
Received by Gorbachev 26 Sep *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 30
Plans Economic Pact With Russia *[TASS]* 30
Sends Message to Gorbachev *[Sofia BTA]* 30
Shevardnadze Greets Hungary on Anniversary *[TASS]* 31
Hungarian President Comments on Relations *[TASS]* 31
Romanian Minister Attends Moscow Economic Talks *[Bucharest ROMPRES]* 32

West Europe

Frolov Visits Italy for Newspaper Festival 32
Attends International Forum *[PRAVDA 22 Sep]* 32
Attends Media Roundtable *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* 33
Meets With Communist Party Head *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* 33
Luxembourg Parliamentarians Arrive in Moscow 34
Meet With Nishanov 26 Sep *[TASS]* 34
Discuss Consolidating Ties *[TASS]* 34
Yanayev Views Greek Head's Congressional Address *[PRAVDA 22 Sep]* 34
Sitaryan, Finnish Premier View Economic Ties *[TASS]* 35
Military Inspectors Arrive in UK 26 Sep *[TASS]* 35

Latin America & Caribbean

Brazilian Aeronautics Minister Arrives *[Moscow International]* 35
Foreign Ministry Views Central American Security *[TASS]* 36

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Deputies To Debate 'Freedom of Conscience' Bill *[TASS]* 37
USSR Supreme Soviet 26 Sep Session Detailed *[Moscow TV]* 37
Freedom of Conscience Bill Approved 'in Principle' 38
Church Leaders' Remarks Noted *[TASS]* 38
'Serious Differences' Expressed *[TASS]* 38
Yazov Explains Troop Movements to Supreme Soviet *[Moscow TV]* 39
Army Issue Disrupts Session *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Sep]* 40
PRAVDA Describes Coup Rumors *[27 Sep]* 41
TASS Summarizes Supreme Soviet Proceedings 41
'Marriage' of Ryzhkov, Shatalin Plans Considered *[London TV]* 42
Ryzhkov Questioned on Possibility of Resignation *[Bratislava SMENA 20 Sep]* 42
'Additional Powers' for Gorbachev Examined *[PRAVDA 26 Sep]* 43

Political & Social

Council of Ministers Debates Harvest Crisis *[PRAVDA 23 Sep]* 44
Emergency Harvest Decree Issued *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 45
IZVESTIYA Ponders 'Collapse' of Central Power *[21 Sep]* 46
'Center Bloc' Holds News Conference 19 Sep *[TRUD 20 Sep]* 49
Democratic, Marxist Platform Leaders Present Views *[TASS]* 50
Afanasyev on Role of 'Democratic Forces' Group *[London MOSCOW NEWS No 17]* 50
Rail Workers Union Opens 25th Congress 20 Sep *[Moscow TV]* 52
Sends Appeal to Supreme Soviet *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Sep]* 53
Miners' Committee Calls for New Trade Union *[KOMSOLMOSKAYA PRAVDA 19 Sep]* 53
CPSU Report on Kirov's Death 'Falsified' *[Moscow International]* 53
Government Adopts Resolution on AIDS *[TASS]* 54
BAM Journalists Resign En Masse From Party *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Sep]* 54
Obituary of Ex-Counterintelligence Chief Carried *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Sep]* 54

Economic

Academicians View Draft on Market Transition 55
Aganbegyan Interviewed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 22 Sep]* 55
Abalkin Advocates Caution *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Sep]* 57
Moscow Mayor Interviewed on Economic Reforms *[Vienna PROFIL 24 Sep]* 62

Agricultural

'Emergency Measures' Adopted To Save Harvest *[TASS]* 63
Virgin Land Oblasts Declare Harvest Emergency *[IZVESTIYA 21 Sep]* 63
Ukraine Farmers Withhold Products, Seek Profits *[Moscow TV]* 64
Disruptions in Meat Deliveries Examined *[Moscow TV]* 64

Scientific

Progress M-5 Cargo Spacecraft Launched *[TASS]* 65
Mir Cosmonauts Continue Research, Experiments *[TASS]* 65
Space Chief Interviewed on Aerospace Exhibition *[Moscow TV]* 65
Aviation-90 Exhibition Ends in Moscow *[TASS]* 65
FRG Firm, Energiya Association Sign Memorandum *[Moscow TV]* 66
'Revolutionary' Aircraft-Hydroplane Developed *[TASS]* 66
Funding Problems Hinder Use of Radio Telescope *[Moscow TV]* 66
High-Energy Physics Seminar Opens in Dubna *[TASS]* 67
New Aviation Monthly Published in Moscow *[TASS]* 67

Military

Vasiliyev Chairs Debate Over Coup Speculations *[Moscow International]* 67
Ministry Official Reports Defense Budget Cuts *[PRAVDA 27 Sep]* 69
Defense Committee Urges New Military Service Laws *[TASS]* 70

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Estonia Discusses 'Economic Border' Issues *[TASS]* 71
Estonian Faction Seeks Tax Relief For Peasants *[TASS]* 71
Estonia Adopts Decree on State Farms *[Moscow Radio]* 71
Coverage of Latvian Supreme Soviet Sessions 72
Alternative Draft Law Adopted *[Moscow Radio]* 72
Economic Resolution Rejected *[TASS]* 72
Prosecutor General Appointed *[TASS]* 72
Further on Appointment *[Riga Radio]* 72
Latvian Group Urges Boycott of Soviet Forces *[Riga Radio]* 73
Latvian Council of Ministers Session Canceled *[Riga Radio]* 73
Lithuanian, USSR Delegations To Meet 2 Oct *[Vilnius Radio]* 73
Landsbergis Discusses Negotiations With Moscow *[Vilnius Radio]* 73
Remarks on Moscow's 'Changed' View *[TASS]* 73
Lithuanian Intelligence Chief Discusses Goals *[Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 26 Sep]* ... 74
Lithuania Adopts Resolution on Political Parties *[TASS]* 75
Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Party Urges Roundtable *[PRAVDA 24 Sep]* 75
Lithuanian Leadership Responds to CPSU Appeal *[SELSKAY.. ZHIZN 18 Sep]* 76
Lessons Learned From Lithuanian Party Demise *[EKHO LITVY 5 Sep]* 77
Lithuanian Delegates for USSR Negotiations Meet *[Vilnius Radio]* 77
Lithuanian Memorandum Issued on CSCE Talks *[EKHO LITVY 5 Sep]* 77
Lithuania Examines Two-Plus-Four Talks *[EKHO LITVY 4 Sep]* 78
Export of Goods Restricted in Lithuania *[Moscow International]* 78
Lithuania's Saudargas Plans U.S. Visit *[Vilnius Radio]* 78

RSFSR

Communist Party Draft Action Program *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Aug]* 78
Interregional Deputies Group Discusses Draft Laws *[TASS]* 86
Economic Independence Conference Held in Ulan-Ude *[Moscow Radio]* 86
Dzasokhov Holds Exchange of Views in Penza Oblast *[Moscow TV]* 86
Prokofyev Comments on Moscow Food Shortages *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Coverage of 31 Aug Leningrad Obkom Plenum 87
Report on Plenum *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Aug]* 87
Gidaspov Issues Report *[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 31 Aug]* 89
Udmurt ASSR Issues Declaration of Sovereignty *[IZVESTIYA 23 Sep]* 95
Urals Oblasts Move To Strengthen Economic Links *[IZVESTIYA 21 Sep]* 96
New Party Seeks Formation of Far East Republic *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Sep]* 97
Karelia Retaliates Over Food Delivery Shortage *[Moscow TV]* 97
Sverdlovsk Air Crash Reported *[Moscow TV]* 97
Kalmyk CPSU First Secretary Released *[Moscow Radio]* 97
New Daily Newspaper To Be Launched *[Moscow Radio]* 97

Western Republics

Belorussia, Tajikistan Sign Economic Accord *[Dushanbe Radio]* 98
Moldavian Party Appeals to Gagauz Communists *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA 2 Sep]* 98
Moldavian Leaders Extol Party Unity *[SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA 2 Sep]* 98
Ukrainian Coal Miners Put Off One-Day Strike *[AFP]* 100
Ukraine's Masol Views 1 Oct 'Challenge' *[Moscow Radio]* 100
Finds Political Climate 'Tough' *[Kiev International]* 100
Ukrainian Produce Bought Up Due to Price Hikes *[IZVESTIYA 22 Sep]* 100
Donetsk Union Opposes All-Ukrainian Strike *[TASS]* 101

Caucasus

Armenians Hand in Weapons, Disband Armed Groups *[Moscow Radio]* 101
Weapons Seizures Continue Throughout NKAO *[Moscow TV]* 101
Party Control Over Armenian KGB To End *[ARMENPRES]* 102
Armenia Party Congress Criticizes Leadership *[Moscow Radio]* 102
NKAO's Council of Trade Unions Disbanded *[Baku Radio]* 102
NKAO Demonstrators Send Message to Gorbachev *[Yerevan Radio]* 102
Consequences of Gas Blockade in Armenia Detailed *[Moscow TV]* 103
Azeri USSR People Deputies' Appeal Detailed *[Baku Radio]* 103
Mutalibov Discusses Communists' Role in Azerbaijan *[PRAVDA 15 Sep]* 104

Military Analyst Urges Comprehensive Test Ban

LD2609182590 Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, addressing the 45th session of the United Nations General Assembly, drew the world body's attention to a disquieting situation: the spread of weapons of mass destruction around the world.

"The situation is beginning to cause alarm. Let us face it: Cracks have appeared in the nuclear non-proliferation regime and the International Atomic Energy Agency is having difficulty expanding the zone of application of its safeguards," he emphasised.

Really, about 40 states, including a rather large number of the so-called near-nuclear ones, are still outside the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Without signing the treaty, they reserve the possiblity on one fine day to declare themselves "nuclear." Representatives of these and many other countries describe the treaty as illogical and hypocritical and dub it as a conspiracy of "the haves against the have-nots."

Apparently, it must be admitted, there is a certain fraction of the truth in such reproaches. The existence of nuclear weapons prevents the democratization of international relations because in these conditions the states obviously divide into "privileged" and "non-privileged" ones.

Perfectly clear is, however, something else: It is hardly advisable to seek to remove the existing discriminatory differences through the spread of nuclear weapons. This would only increase the danger to everyone. Genuine security and democratization in the world as a whole would be promoted only by complete elimination of the nuclear potentials of all states.

A comprehensive nuclear test ban would become an important step towards such elimination. This is why Shevardnadze stated from the U.N. rostrum: "As a matter of utmost urgency, nuclear tests must be stopped. If testing is stopped, we have a chance to survive. Otherwise the world will perish."

It can be added that without the termination of nuclear detonations the very destiny of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, an extension of which will be considered in 1995, remains unclear.

In view of the urgency of a solution to the nuclear test ban problem, the Soviet Union suggested that U.N. member nations think about holding a world wide parliamentary referendum on the issue.

Moscow and Washington made an important step of late, working out and signing protocols on limiting nuclear tests. This opened up an opportunity for the ratification of the 1974 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Tests and the 1976 Treaty on Underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes. The U.S. Senate has just ratified these documents. The USSR Supreme Soviet will undoubtedly do that soon.

But what next? To begin with, the discussion of this problem should be intensified at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament and Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear explosions should be continued.

At the very outset of the talks, the Soviet Union and the United States are known to have agreed that, following the ratification of the "threshold" treaties, the sides should move on to coordinating further intermediate limitations on nuclear tests—in yield and annual amounts—on the way to the ultimate goal of complete termination of nuclear tests as part of an effective process of nuclear disarmament.

The Soviet Union is ready for intensive negotiations. But is the United States prepared for them? There is no clarity about that. However, the recently adopted decision of the U.S. House of Representatives, to the effect that the United States should inform the Soviet Union of its intention to immediately resume bilateral talks that would quickly lead to the elaboration of a treaty on a full verifiable ban on nuclear tests, can be regarded as a reassuring sign.

However, there has been no positive reaction on the part of the U.S. Administration either to the Soviet Union's calls or to the U.S. lawmakers' decision.

General Views Novaya Zemlya Nuclear Test Plans

90SV0077A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 90 p 3

[Article by Mikhail Chernyshov, APN science columnist: "Test Range on Novaya Zemlya]

[Text] While the politicians are trying to come to an agreement on a numerical reduction in nuclear weapons stockpiles, the process of their qualitative improvement is moving along in its own way. Nuclear charges continue to burst in deep shafts and cleverly arranged tunnels, marking that technical progress that mankind should have gotten rid of a long time ago. Until recently, two test ranges were the leaders in numbers of tests: one in Nevada (United States) and one in the area of Semipalatinsk (USSR).

"With respect to the Semipalatinsk test range," says Lieutenant General Sergey Zelentsov, deputy chief of one of the main directorates of the USSR Ministry of Defense, "it cannot be ruled out that by 1993 nuclear tests will come to a complete stop on the range, and that another nuclear test range on Novaya Zemlya will take upon itself the entire future program of nuclear weapons development..."

Plans for shifting the center of gravity of tests to Novaya Zemlya did not come about by themselves. The establishment of a test range in the area of Semipalatinsk was started at the end of the 1940's at the initiative of

Academician I. Kurchatov, the manager of atomic operations in the USSR. At that time, these areas were remote and sparsely populated places. But time passed, they were made more habitable, and now these are far from sparsely populated territories. Of course, everything is done during tests to eliminate the spread of radioactivity beyond the bounds of those immediate zones where explosions are conducted. The test method is such that a charge, when it explodes, apparently tightly seals itself in the ground. But one can also understand the psychology of those who live on territories adjacent to the test range.

Explosions shook the ground from month to month. Incidentally, the force of man-made earthquakes in Semipalatinsk, which was situated quite far from the test range, sometimes reached a three- four magnitude of seismic intensity. During explosions, columns of dust rise above mountains. And you must query: Is this ordinary dust or radioactive dust? In short, the public movement for the cessation of tests on the Semipalatinsk test range recently has become so powerful that the USSR Supreme Soviet passed a decree requiring the USSR Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of the Nuclear Power Industry to examine the question of stopping tests on the Semipalatinsk test range and to submit a recommendation to the USSR Council of Ministers.

"It must be said," Zelentsov continued his narrative, "that the test range on Novaya Zemlya was by no means opened just yesterday. It has been in operation since 1954. More than a hundred tests have been conducted there already, but preference was given to Semipalatinsk for the simple reason that transport and other expenditures on explosions in Kazakhstan, of course, are lower in comparison with costs for similar work on Novaya Zemlya. While on the average 15 explosions were conducted annually on the Semipalatinsk test range, on Novaya Zemlya, also because of unfavorable climatic conditions, the work was limited to one-two, or a maximum of three tests a year..."

From the beginning of the 1940's to the middle of the 1980's, more than 1,500 nuclear explosions were conducted in the world by five states that possessed nuclear weapons: the United States, USSR, France, Great Britain, and China. The highest number of explosions belongs to the United States. The ratio "in favor of the United States" continues to this day.

The nuclear powers have long since recognized the danger of an uncontrolled arms race, and they adopted a number of agreements on test limits. Since 1963, nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and under water have been banned. In the future, the USSR and the United States have agreed to limit the upper threshold of yield of charges undergoing testing to 150 kilotons. However, the idea of a complete and general ban on nuclear weapons tests cannot make headway as a number of states, especially India, Argentina, Pakistan, Brazil, Israel, and the Republic of South Africa remain outside the agreement on nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. All of this indicates that the last nuclear explosion on the planet very likely will not be heard very soon.

Novaya Zemlya is a group of islands that stretches in a longitudinal direction for approximately a thousand kilometers, and their overall area is more than 80,000 square kilometers. Approximately one-fourth is mountains covered with ice, and the remaining territory is hilly arctic tundra. It is 200-300 kilometers to the nearest population centers on the continental part of the USSR. The archipelago itself has a settlement of testers, and military subunits are deployed there. Several powerful air and above-water explosions at altitudes of three to 10 kilometers and also nuclear weapons underwater tests were conducted on Novaya Zemlya before the treaty of 1963. Naturally, this led to a worsening of the radiation situation on the archipelago, but in the past 30 years, as numerous tests have indicated, even with continuing underground testing the level of background radiation has fallen to the value of the natural background of the planet, and in a radiation sense it can be considered ecologically safe. Verification of the radiation situation is conducted not only by services of the USSR Ministry of Defense, but also by specialists of the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control, USSR Ministry of Health, and the USSR Academy of Sciences.

"The problem of increasing the intensity of tests on the Novaya Zemlya test range, with a reduction on the Semipalatinsk test range," emphasizes Zelentsov, "is very complicated for us. A place cannot be found on the planet now where a nuclear explosion, even with all precautionary measures, would not affect someone's interests. There are enough unpopulated areas on USSR territory, but they are not all suitable for setting up a new test range. For example, if there are significant deposits of minerals, then sooner or later such areas will start to become inhabited. Careful geologic explorations were conducted on Novaya Zemlya, and they showed that there are virtually no major deposits here. There is also no indigenous population on the archipelago. And, finally, if a test range is to be established absolutely in a new place, then this will require enormous expenditures, but Novaya Zemlya already has a base, and it has the necessary structures, although, I repeat, the transfer of all tests to the archipelago will be associated with significant organizational complexities and, in any case, it will require an increase in expenditures. But I would also like to note that all discussions on the transfer of tests are still of a preliminary nature. It is necessary that these plans be approved by the appropriate levels, including the USSR Supreme Soviet..."

The position of military specialists who support the operational readiness of nuclear weapons, and of the nuclear physicists who are engaged in basic research, is clear: They have to do their work. But, you see, today's far north is also no longer an icy wasteland. Settlements

are scattered along the continental coast, teams of geologists and oil industry workers are working there, and ship convoys are plying the Northern Sea route. And, indeed, our northern neighbors—the Finns, Swedes, and Danes are not indifferent to the state of affairs on a Soviet nuclear test range. How does one deal with this?

"Our country," says Zelentsov, "cannot unilaterally stop all tests, and we also cannot do without an agreement, first and foremost with the United States, to reduce the yields of test charges, for this is fraught with a breach of parity. The main obstacle to the achievement of an agreement on reducing the number of tests, and also the yield of test charges, and this is achievable in principle, is the aim of the United States to conduct nuclear explosions within the framework of the SDI program. Behind all of this is the hope of creating principally new types of weapons—superpowerful, with instantaneous fast action; we are talking, in particular, about lasers with nuclear excitation and other such systems. However, while an agreement on a complete test ban is not achievable at present, it could have been possible to come to an agreement on the reduction of charge yields to 30 and further even to 20 kilotons, and to limit the number of tests, let us say, to 10 and even fewer per year. Measures for verifying adherence to such agreements can be considered adequately developed at the present time. [no ending quotation marks as published]

Everything that has been said, incidentally, also does not contradict the idea of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, which the Soviet Union proposed at one time. The implementation of this idea depends not only on the USSR and the Scandinavian countries. It is understandable that it must be examined together with all of the other aspects of the problem of nuclear disarmament and a general ban on nuclear weapons tests. The attainment of such aims is possible in the event that all states renounce nuclear tests. However, understanding the concern of the population of both our northern territories and the Scandinavian countries, we intend henceforth to conduct underground tests with guarantees for their total safety and, in addition, in a situation of maximum glasnost; that is, to invite to tests not only verification service departments that are independent of a vested interest, but also representatives of the public, including the press.

TASS Reports on U.S. Troop Cuts in Europe

LD2609221190 Moscow TASS in English 2027 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin]

[Text] Washington September 26 TASS—U.S. troops in Europe will be reduced by 40,000 in the 1991 fiscal year (which begins in the United States on October 1, 1990 and will continue until September 31, 1991), U.S. Secretary of Defence Richard Cheney announced here today.

The measure is taken after consultations with NATO allies and in anticipation that a CFE agreement will be completed and signed by the end of this year, the Defence Secretary's statement emphasises.

"We have to begin the drawdown now to respond in an orderly way to changing security requirements and declining defence budgets," Cheney said.

It is planned to withdraw from Europe an aggregate of 10,000 Airforce and 30,000 U.S. Army personnel. As is seen from the Pentagon's statement, although part of the personnel will begin to withdraw from bases on October 1, this year, the curtailment of the activity of units subject to cutbacks will begin only on January 1, 1991.

The Pentagon explains this by considerations of purely technical nature, the need for a balanced "de-activation" of units and by the fact a withdrawal of military units usually takes from three to four months.

Problems Associated With CFE Talks Assessed

PM2509110590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Article by S. Rogov, doctor of historical sciences: "No Change on the Western Front?"]

[Text] Information about the progress of the talks on cuts in conventional armed forces and arms in Europe has been somewhat forgotten against the backdrop of the alarming reports from the Persian Gulf region.

Press silence on the Vienna talks is not, unfortunately, a case of "no news is good news." The Vienna talks, along with the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva on strategic offensive arms cuts, are of key significance in the creation of a new international security system.

The process of moving on from a bipolar to a multipolar structure of international relations is under way in the world today. A difficult task is emerging here: How are we to preserve and strengthen military stability amid the radical political and economic changes?

The problem is complicated by the fact that the previous mechanisms for ensuring security have proved to be of little use in the new situation. After all, such alliances as NATO and the Warsaw Pact constituted a militarized form of ideological confrontation. They were destined to wage and not to overcome the "cold war."

With the end of the ideological "crusades," now that the tasks of building a common European home have come to the fore, an extrabloc security structure is needed for all its "inhabitants." Neither NATO nor the Warsaw Pact are suitable for this task. The new European security system must be based on principles of interdependence and pluralism among all its participants.

However, the negotiating process has well and truly lagged behind the political changes of the last few months. The point is that there was no question of an end to bloc confrontation six months ago when the concept for the Vienna talks was being elaborated. It was

thought then that the most that could be achieved was to regulate and stabilize NATO and Warsaw Pact confrontation by securing virtually mirrorlike equality for their armed forces in Europe. Hence the accord secured by the sides at the talks on parity in tanks, armored combat vehicles, guns, combat aircraft, and helicopters.

Innumerable details had to be coordinated to elaborate accords of this kind. But the political situation in Europe changed drastically while the diplomats were conducting the difficult talks. It is only from the force of inertia that one can now talk about the military structure of the Warsaw Pact. One of its members—the GDR—for all intents and purposes no longer exists; Hungary is openly raising the question of the possibility of joining NATO; and several other East European states are thinking about leaving the Warsaw Pact. The withdrawal from the East European states of almost 600,000 Soviet servicemen has begun. Some republics in the Soviet Union itself are declaring "permanent neutrality."

For that reason something that seemed a great achievement a year ago seems obsolete in many respects under the new conditions. There has been a change of era but the delegations in Vienna are still arguing about how to ensure parity between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Moreover, the planned cuts only reduce but do not eliminate the arms stockpiles. Suffice it to say that there will still be 40,000 tanks in Europe—ten times more than Hitler had 22 June 1941.

However the main question today of ensuring European security—the prevention of a military threat from a united Germany—which provides a source of concern not just for us, is not even on the agenda at the talks. A new forum has been quickly set up outside the Vienna framework to solve the problem of Germany's military-political integration into Europe. The "two-plus-four" talks between the victorious powers and the Germans have enabled a compromise to be reached—the limitation of the numerical strength of Germany's armed forces to 370,000 men—although this accord still has to be linked to the future Vienna agreements.

The "historic" treaty on cuts in conventional armed forces and arms will most probably only prove to be an intermediate stage in the creation of an all-European security structure. "Vienna-1" should be followed as quickly as possible by "Vienna-2" which will probably be founded on quite different principles—not on parity between opposing blocs but on rejection of the policy of amassing excessive levels of arms, the reduction of "ceilings" for arms and armed forces to an agreed level of defensive sufficiency for each state, and also on the creation of joint security structures on the European continent.

In order to move toward this goal, we must rapidly complete the current talks that will lay the foundation for subsequent steps. Unfortunately, no substantial progress has been recorded in Vienna of late. The specter of deadlock has actually appeared. Serious misgivings are emerging regarding the signing of a treaty this year and regarding the holding of the November summit involving the states participating in the Helsinki process.

This loss of pace is fraught with unpredictable consequences. After all, the lack of any all-European agreement recording the commitment of all the continent's states to reducing military tension will add to the uncertainty and lack of confidence, which may adversely affect the formation of new mechanisms for cooperation and trust on our continent. If progress is not consolidated, the very existence of the new system of security in Europe may be called in question.

What is hampering progress at the Vienna talks? There are a considerable number of both objective and subjective reasons.

On the one hand, the range of participants in the talks is extremely broad. Acute disagreements often arise not only between members of opposing blocs but also between members of the same alliance. On the other hand, the negotiators are having to accomplish a great deal of work and monitor a vast number of highly diverse technical and geopolitical parameters governing the balance of military forces. For instance, the objective study and comprehensive, broad discussion of technical and organizational questions of verification and the elimination and storage of arms are not yet over.

The talks are frequently held up by attempts to seek one-sided advantages. A particularly dogged battle was mounted over the conceptual definition of what is a "tank," an "aircraft," and so on. The point is that weapons systems vary considerably in different countries and arguments as to what to include and not include in a particular category of arms subject to cuts are by no means theoretical. Too much time has been wasted on discussing these problems.

However, a compromise has still not been reached on a number of highly important questions. For instance, NATO is refusing to count carrier-launched naval aviation but is demanding that surface-launched naval aviation be included in the "ceilings" on combat aircraft. This kind of "arithmetic" is, of course, designed to put the Soviet Union in a disadvantageous position.

There are problems on which our position also appears contentious. The key one being the maximum level of arms for a single country. At first we proposed a "ceiling" of 35-40 percent—while NATO members suggested 30 percent—of the total quantity of arms in Europe. But the Soviet delegation has toughened its positions of late and is stubbornly pressing for a level of "sufficiency" of 40 percent for the USSR.

This approach on our side is obviously based on a desire to create a kind of safety margin under conditions where the preservation of the Warsaw Pact seems extremely dubious. But will this prudence not be detrimental to our long-term national security interests?

First, by placing the Soviet Union in a special position in comparison with other European countries, our position at the European talks signifies, whether we like it or not, the continuation of confrontation with the West. Our country seems to associate military danger with the threat of a fresh invasion from Europe, as was frequently the case in the past. But is it not clear that the invasion scenario is the least likely threat against a "nuclear superpower," as we will obviously still be in the foreseeable future. If you consider the fact that Germany's military potential, under the treaty signed in Moscow, will be drastically restricted, this aim seems quite unfeasible.

As indicated by public statements from some of our military, we have nevertheless continued and are continuing, through the force of inertia, to stick to our customary idea of the means of guaranteeing our security in Europe that contradict our own idea of creating a common European home. In other words, are we aiming for purely military and not political means of ensuring the country's security?

Second, the 40-percent quota of arms demanded by our Vienna delegation may revive the specter of the "Soviet threat to Europe."

One must acknowledge frankly that this threat did indeed exist, although we are not the only ones to blame for this. In one of his articles Marshal S.F. Akhromeyev described how the USSR reacted to the U.S. threat to Soviet territory at the height of the "cold war": "The Soviet Union also began to take military steps in response to U.S. actions (and sometimes first). It did not have a chance to create a military threat to the United States similar to that which they posed to the USSR... The USSR and its allies took a different path. They developed a mighty grouping of ground—mainly tank—forces on their European territory and created (in response to the U.S. threat) a military threat to U.S. allies in Western Europe."

But since then we have for a long time now been presenting an answering threat to U.S. territory and ensured strategic parity. The treaty on strategic offensive arms cuts under preparation at the Geneva talks in parallel with the Vienna talks ensures the preservation of the Soviet-U.S. balance and mutual nuclear deterrence. Why should we endeavor to once again create the semblance of a military threat to European states?

It is easy to imagine Europe's response to a power that will be almost equal in arms to virtually all the other European countries together. As a result the NATO military organization will obviously become stronger once again instead of NATO's being politically transformed and the military aspects of its activity slackening off. One cannot preclude the fact that the economic and political consolidation of Western Europe will be supplemented by its military integration at a time when we may find ourselves without any allies at all. Will our neighbors want to admit an over-armed inhabitant into the common European home?

Third, our negotiating position effectively requires the disproportionate disarmament of the East European countries. According to official Warsaw Pact figures, they account today for roughly 20 percent of the arms in Europe. If our demand were accepted, our current allies' quota would be halved.

Having begun to withdraw our troops, we are today abandoning the idea of "forward-based defense" for the USSR in Central Europe. But this will not entail a loss of strategic depth for the defense of our state if NATO keeps its present borders and the East European states are indeed independent, prosperous, and strong enough not to become a "corridor" for adventurers. It is a well-known fact that weak states seek strong patrons. Will we not be pushing them under NATO's wing?

Fourth, the demand for "sufficiency" at the level of 40 percent of all the arms in Europe will mean—as the table below shows—that the USSR alone may still have on its European territory up to 16,000 tanks, roughly 15,000-16,000 artillery systems, more than 22,000 armored personnel carriers and infantry fighting vehicles [IFV], and roughly 5,000 aircraft. What is more, considerable forces untouched by the Vienna agreements will be kept on our Asian territory.

Correlation of Warsaw Pact and NATO Forces in Europe (figures in thousands of units)

	Tanks		Armored Combat Vehicles		Artillery		Helicopters		Aircraft	
	NATO data	Warsaw Pact data	NATO data	Warsaw Pact data	NATO data	Warsaw Pact data	NATO data	Warsaw Pact data	NATO data	Warsaw Pact data
Warsaw Pact	51.5	59.47	93.4	70.33	43.4	71.56	3.7	2.785	8.25	7.876
of which USSR	37	41.58	64.00	45	33	50.275	2.85	2.2	6.05	5.955
NATO	22.224	30.69	47.064	46.90	17.326	57.06	2.599	5.27	4.507	7.13
"Vienna" ceilings on alliance	20		28		16.5-20		1.9		5.2-6.2	
30-percent ceilings per country	12		18.8		9.9-12		1.14		3.12-3.72	
40-percent ceilings per country	16		22.4		13.2-16		1.52		4.1-4.9	

So does this mean once again "the Red Army rules from the British seas to the taiga," once again "guns not butter," and... farewell to the hope of our country's escaping from the vicious circle in which we found ourselves as a result of the gamble on confrontation with all the world around us?

Here is another aspect of no small importance of the problems that our diplomats are encountering in Vienna. Our position once again seems to have found itself hostage, to put it mildly, to inadequate initial information which overstated NATO forces and understated Warsaw Pact forces. Our Defense Ministry's assurances of "approximate equality" in Europe do not seem to match the facts. Establishing truly equal levels for NATO and the Warsaw Pact will result in us and our allies cutting by almost three times our number of tanks and artillery and the number of IFV and armored personnel carriers by a factor of 2.5 at a time when the Western cuts for these types of arms will be considerably smaller since the NATO countries barely make the agreed "ceilings." In other words, we have, so to speak, overreached ourselves with our hypersecrecy.

The incomprehensible diligence with which we endeavored to include not only ground forces but also aviation in the agenda of the talks, citing Western superiority in this type of arms, is also surprising. Everything indicates that after having literally thrust this issue on NATO we will still be forced to eliminate considerably more aircraft than our Western partners. We will have to pay a considerable price for our ill-considered positions.

Nevertheless the numbers game seems to be continuing. According to Western sources there is another problem with tanks. The point is that, as the Defense Ministry recently stated, we have already reduced the number of our tanks in Europe by 15,800. The fact that several thousand tanks have "disappeared" from the zone of the cuts may result in a loss of the capital of trust which we have acquired in Europe with such difficulty. If these arms were urgently moved beyond the Urals, as NATO members are claiming, this would also undermine trust in our initiatives on the Asian continent.

The old saw says: A miser pays double. We are paying two-fold and three-fold for our meanness with glasnost in the defense sphere. Of course, it is up to the negotiators to uphold their state's positions at the forum in Vienna. But departmental methods of elaborating this position in strict secrecy—whereby not only the public and specialists, but also the Supreme Soviet, are deprived of full information—do not seem to facilitate an optimum assessment of the parameters for reasonable sufficiency in the defense sphere.

However, there is no time to be lost. Iraq's aggression against Kuwait has demonstrated most graphically the need for the most speedy creation of new mechanisms for ensuring international security both at global and regional levels. The summit meeting in Helsinki showed that the requisite preconditions are ripe for this. But it will only be possible to move on to the practical building of this system when crucial steps have been taken to dismantle the confrontational instruments inherited from the "cold war" and used to ensure security, such as Warsaw Pact-NATO confrontation in Europe.

Pact Foreign Ministers To Resolve Tanks Issue

PM2609161790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Sitting in Prague"]

[Text] Prague, 24 Sep—A routine sitting of the special Warsaw Pact Disarmament Commission was held in Prague 22-23 September at the level of foreign ministers and chiefs of general staff.

The discussion of the maximum permissible levels of arms and military hardware for the allied states following the signing of a treaty on conventional forces in Europe was the main question on the sitting's agenda.

The greatest rapprochement of positions was secured on combat aircraft and helicopters. It has not yet proved possible to reach consensus on the numbers of tanks, armored personnel carriers, and artillery weapons. Questions which remained unresolved at the Prague sitting will be discussed at a meeting involving the Warsaw Pact foreign ministers in New York, where they will be taking part in the work of the next UN General Assembly session.

Commentary Welcomes End to CEMA Subsidies

PM2609145790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 90 Second Edition p 7

[Commentary by Yevgeniy Shashkov under the rubric "View From Moscow": "What Lies Beyond the 'Point of No Return'"]

[Text] The process of purification in the countries that were part of what was previously called the socialist community has affected virtually all spheres of life. New leaders who have replaced the Communists are conducting this process impetuously, sometimes without heed for diplomatic considerations. They are trying to get past the "point of no return" as they say in aviation, as quickly as possible. Once that point has been passed, any movement back is impossible; there is no way back...

The de-ideologization of political, humanitarian, and other ties with the Soviet Union is going ahead at full speed. The withdrawal of Soviet troops from East Europe is just as swift.

The governments of these states are doing everything they can to expedite the above-mentioned processes. Unfortunately the de-ideologization of our foreign economic ties is considerably lagging behind those processes. But this is not happening through the Soviet Union's fault. On the contrary—the USSR is the prime mover here. Meanwhile, in the countries of our East European and other partners that process is merely creaking along.

It can rightfully be asked: Is such a process necessary at all in the foreign economic sphere? To my mind, it is as necessary as in the political sphere and in the humanitarian sphere. Under the influence of false political priorities, a great deal that is superficial and damaging has accumulated in the USSR's economic cooperation with the former socialist countries. The ideologized attitude toward economic ties, the autarkic nature of cooperation, and the ignoring of commodity-money relations have led to a deformation of the structure of economic links between the USSR and its allies.

Many people remember the atmosphere of the stagnation years and the situation in which politicians representing both the state and party leadership would determine the size of credits, the volume of trade, and the prices of raw materials and commodities, and would sign long-term plans and agreements. This was accompanied by innumerable oaths of allegiance to the USSR and to "proletarian internationalism," and by the clinking of the "gold stars" and orders with which Soviet leaders were festooned.

Problems were resolved in a simple way, without any "economic diplomacy." All a leader from one of the fraternal countries had to do was to bamboozle one of the higher representatives of the Soviet leadership of the time, with the possibility of instability in the particular "link of the socialist community" headed by him, and, while he implied there was a prospect of geostrategic instability in this connection, he then could boldly appeal for assistance, including Soviet petrodollars.

Naturally, this is one of a few scenarios, and it has been as simplified to the greatest degree possible. In practice in such "operations," foreign policy bodies, foreign economic, ideological, and other organs of the interested party would go energetically to work. But whatever happened, there is no doubt that the Soviet side frequently signed decisions on "an oil fix" and other subsidies without taking into account the USSR's long-term national interests, and it goes without saying, without asking the people's advice. It happened that foundations for cooperation in the long term would arise on the basis of such agreements. The most lamentable thing is that they exist in our mutual relations with allied countries to this day. In my view, this partly explains the extremely high ceilings in the Soviet export of fuel and raw materials to these states. Today, when the USSR is forced to reduce the dose of the "oil fix" for objective reasons, a number of countries are starting to go "cold turkey" and this is accompanied by accusations against us to the effect that all the economic difficulties originate from the Soviet Union.

Is this the case?

I will not cite the calculations of Soviet scientists about the size of the subsidies and the value of the "petrodollar rain," the mighty torrents of which have irrigated our allies' economic ground for almost two decades. This might be met with disbelief. I am using American scientists' similar calculations that were recently cited in the publication BUSINESS WORLD, for after all, the opinion of specialists from the United States, is received

with greater reverence than that of Soviet specialists, especially in East European countries.

The American economists M. Marrese and J. Vanous came to the conclusion that in 1971-1980 alone, indirect subsidies from the USSR to East European CEMA socialist countries amounted to $75.5 billion. This occurred in connection with the export of "hard commodities" (fuel, raw materials, and so on) to East European countries at contract prices that were considerably lower than world prices, in exchange for "soft commodities" (machines, equipment, consumer goods) at contract prices that were considerably higher than current world prices. At the same time the quality of these goods could in no way be compared with that of analogous Western goods. In their monograph "The Subsidization of Soviet Trade in Eastern Europe," the American authors stress that during this whole decade, the USSR supplied energy sources to the CEMA countries at half the world price. The American economists calculated that subsidies in 1974-1978 comprised $28 per capita in the European CEMA countries. This sum was distributed in various ways depending on the political circumstances. For example, it was $58 for each Bulgarian. But the main recipients of Soviet subsidies were the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Poland.

There was a similar practice in CEMA in the 1980's too. Bulgarian Prime Minister A. Lukanov confirmed this among other things. At the beginning of September, he reported that over the past few years, Bulgaria, for example, received additional income worth 1.5-2 billion leva from the Soviet Union reckoned in terms of world prices. It is also known that starting from 1978, right up to 1985, the Soviet Union gave Bulgaria assistance on a large scale free of charge. In addition to this, almost all of the previous regimes in the socialist countries earned money form reexporting Soviet petroleum and its derivatives on the quiet. And Cuba even got the "OK" from Soviet organizations to do this.

The facts I have cited come as no surprise either to Soviet specialists in foreign economic ties, or more particularly to their colleagues from the allied countries. It is something else that is surprising. Why they keep silent. Why they do not explain to their fellow citizens that the level of export of Soviet petroleum reached such a height in the past few decades that even with the reduction of supplies of liquid fuel, it still remains extremely high. This is borne out by the facts. For example, as the newspaper PRACE writes, Czechoslovakia continued to export gasoline to the West throughout the first six months of 1990. As another Czechoslovak newspaper, LIDOVE NOVINY, notes, only 10 percent of the 16.6 million tonnes of Soviet petroleum is used for vehicle fuel production in the country. Most of it, the newspaper stresses, manages to get devoured by the technically backward industry and other energy-intensive sectors of the economy.

LIDOVE NOVINY has shown the true, basic reason for the difficulties that East European countries are now experiencing. Many politicians, economists, and journalists—and not only from this region—in their assessments of the prevailing foreign economic situation, cannot do without the usual, stagnant ideological stereotypes. Instead of a serious objective analysis, propagandist cliches, which everyone is fed up with, are used. Even those countries where the Communists are no longer in power are resorting to the old ideological symbols. There the thesis exists that the "Brezhnev tank doctrine" was previously used in East and Central Europe, whereas now there is the "doctrine of petroleum diktat." It is startling to what extent the ideological dogmas of administrative-edict socialism are still alive in people's consciousness. Although, on the other hand, there is nothing surprising in this. We know from the example of our own country that it is much easier to debunk someone else's intrigues from rally platforms than to be concerned with routine questions of energy saving, the more so since the energy intensiveness of our economies exceeds all reasonable proportions.

Today, when the former members of the socialist community as well as the USSR are on the brink of entering the market or have already done so, it is becoming increasingly clear that the old concept of foreign trade links will never become part of the market economy. Furthermore, as a number of economists and writers on international affairs believe, the unjustified orientation of 60 percent of the USSR's foreign economic turnover to the aforesaid countries will become increasingly clear, bearing in mind their modest part in world production and international trade. But the probable reduction in the trade turnover with East European states is not at all a reason for serious alarm. Healthy ties based on world prices and free currency will promote the consolidation of economic relations with these states on a natural and really mutually advantageous basis, cleansed of extraneous ideological matter. Together we must get past the "point of no return" in the sphere of cooperation.

Shevardnadze Holds Meetings During UN Visit

Talks With Republic Ministers

PM2609125990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 90 p 3

[Report by correspondent Ye. Ovcharenko: "When Does Shevardnadze Get Any Sleep?"]

[Text] New York—Foreign ministers will be spending their September in the company of the international community. The 45th UN General Assembly session, at which they will represent their countries, will be held in the early fall. At the same time, they will be holding intensive meetings with their colleagues. For example, in the space of 13 days Eduard Shevardnadze will have over 90 discussions with leaders of foreign policy departments.

These began with his meetings with the foreign ministers of Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Kazakhstan. What was discussed? We put this question to Eduard Amvrosiyevich.

[Shevardnadze] Each republic is now trying to work out just what sovereignty means in the international arena and how to realize it. In this respect things are easier for the Ukraine and Belorussia: They have more extensive opportunities and more experience. Although our embassies do not have corresponding representatives from each of them, we discussed this and what to do about foreign currency and the material-technical base. We determined that we would help the republics to safeguard their constitutional rights and sovereignty.

[Ovcharenko] You will be speaking in the general political debate. What will be the main point covered by it?

[Shevardnadze] I think we have reached the stage where we can implement the great ideas enshrined in the founders of the UN Charter. This is not just an ordinary session. It is the start of a breakthrough. The crisis in the Gulf emerged—and just look at how the Security Council has been functioning.

[Ovcharenko] Will you be in the chair for the first time at the Security Council session?

[Shevardnadze] Yes, I have already had a look at a likely scenario. I will have to bang my gavel about 15 times... [Shevardnadze ends]

For our part, we would add that the gavel is a procedural implement announcing that a resolution has been adopted. If one bears in mind that the session will be devoted to the question of the "Conflict Between Iraq and Kuwait," it only remains for us to hope that its participants agree and adopt as many resolutions as possible.

What else is in the minister's program?

"Shevardnadze meets with Republic of Korea Foreign Minister Choe Ho-chung 30 September. Can we expect any fundamental changes to come out of this meeting with regard to relations between our countries?" I asked V. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister, and I received a reply that was entirely diplomatic in its evasiveness:

"Just wait. Why be in such a hurry?"

We are in a hurry for news, while allowing the diplomats the right to keep their secrets. OK, we can wait until 30 September.

The same day, incidentally, our minister's program includes his attendance at the opening of the "World Summit for Children." Presidents, premiers, and their personal representatives from more than 70 countries will take part in it. I talked with Eduard Kudryavtsev, USSR deputy permanent representative at the United Nations:

[Kudryavtsev] The idea of holding the meeting arose late last year. Its initiators were the leaders of Canada, Pakistan, Sweden, Mali, Mexico, and Egypt. During the Houston summit it was actively supported by Bush, Thatcher, and other "G-7" leaders. The aim is to draw the world's attention to the problems of children.

[Ovcharenko] But if the leaders of 70 countries recognize the full importance of solving children's problems and understand their aspects in their own countries, to whom can they appeal apart from themselves? Who is higher than they are?

[Kudryavtsev] It is planned to adopt a declaration and an action program. And when a country's leader signs it, this will be a specific commitment. Although it is quite obvious that, for instance, Canadian children have different problems from their fellows in the USSR or Mali...

[Ovcharenko] Whether by accident or design, you have hit the nail on the head: Simply because we have developing countries for neighbors, we have been able to shrug off the euphoria of being a "privileged class." How much will it cost to stage the summit?

[Kudryavtsev] More than $2 million, according to preliminary calculations.

Holds News Conference 26 Sep

LD2609105290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0945 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Kochetkov, Nikolay Maslov, Yevgeniy Menkes, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations, 26 Sep (TASS)—I still believe that a peaceful settlement in the Persian Gulf is possible and am doing all I can to solve the problem that way, USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze told journalists accredited to the United Nations.

For this to be done, he said, the status quo in the region has to be restored. No other way out of the situation has

developed, and Saddam Husayn must recognize that this is exactly what the world expects of him.

The Soviet minister noted that as yet, no decision on the use of force to solve the Persian Gulf crisis has been taken by the Security Council, nor have such proposals been considered at the special session of the council on the Gulf situation at the foreign minister level. However, E.A. Shevardnadze stressed, under present conditions in the region no one can predict the way events will develop. There are hundreds of thousands of people and a huge number of weapons concentrated on a piece of land in the Gulf zone, he said, so "anything could happen" there. There is, I repeat, only one way out: Iraq withdrawing from Kuwait.

In response to whether the world was approaching the start of combat operations against Iraq, E.A. Shevardnadze said: I would not say that. The UN and the Security Council have all the necessary powers and capabilities, and should we be forced to use force we will use it "on a collective basis," through the UN and the Security Council, and that was probably the main point in what I said in my speech about "suppressing acts of aggression."

From what has happened in the Persian Gulf we should all draw the appropriate conclusions: What has happened there today could happen somewhere else tomorrow, the minister continued. And now we must think—and I spoke about this in my speech at the session—about reestablishing the appropriate UN institutions, of activating the Military Staff Committee of the Security Council, of studying practical aspects of placing national troop contingents at the disposal of the council. I do not agree with the claim that "time is running out" for peace efforts. Political methods of solving the problem are still a priority, but experience shows that measures of coercion are also needed. There cannot be any time "schedules" for the use of military methods, E.A. Shevardnadze stressed, but if an "unpredictable situation" arises, the adoption of such a decision will become possible.

Answering the question, does Iraqi President Saddam Husayn come under the category of "criminal against humanity" (with regard to a sentence in his speech), the minister replied, "He was not naming anyone specifically in his speech." All I meant was, this is an acknowledgement of the need to adopt the appropriate laws against those who threaten to use mass destruction weapons or seizure of hostages or mass terror for purposes of blackmail.

As regards my attitude to the Iraqi president, I am acquainted with him and have met with him repeatedly in the past. The introduction of troops into Kuwait was something I did not expect. It was no easy matter for me to make a decision on sanctions: the friendliest relations existed between our countries. As old friends we call on him to think again and submit to the demands of common sense. I want to say once more that it is not yet too late, the situation can still be saved.

Shevardnadze described as very important the session of the Security Council held under his chairmanship and the resolution on additional sanctions against Iraq which was adopted. The work with delegations to agree the text of the resolution was done with great commitment. And, in general, the session proceeded in a constructive spirit. As for condemnation of the aggression and attitude to it, we had no differences, the minister stated.

Asked whether aircraft heading for Iraq will be forced to land for inspection, E.A. Shevardnadze replied in the negative, pointing out that complications could arise if that were so. According to the resolution, states that have airfields located on their territory take on obligations to implement checks independently.

Do you believe that the aggression can be stopped on a multilateral basis, and are you ready to participate in such actions, the journalists asked.

I have already said in my speech at the General Assembly session that the mechanism spoken of in the UN Charter must be reinstated, the minister replied. The authors of the charter foresaw everything, including a political resolution of situations of conflict, as well as other methods. We propose that all these mechanisms be created. As permanent members of the Security Council voting in favor of the current resolution, we shall be implementing it. All the same, I hope that peaceful means to solve the crisis will be found. I very much hope so.

Discusses MBFR With Baker

LD2609154390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1505 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Kochetkov, Yevgeniy Menkes, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations, 26 Sep—A meeting took place at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York this morning between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, and James Baker, U.S. secretary of state.

Replying prior to the start of the meeting to journalists' questions concerning its agenda, both ministers pointed out that the range of problems being examined would be fairly broad. The issue of the progress of the MBFR talks will, according to Eduard Shevardnadze, occupy the central place. It is necessary to bring these talks to a logical conclusion, he noted. He said he had instructions to make use of his stay in New York to hold additional consultations on this issue with all interested sides.

Replying to journalists' question concerning the Soviet reaction to the United States' intention to reduce its Armed Forces in Europe even before the relevant agreement is signed, the Soviet minister pointed out that so far, the U.S. side has not made a statement of this kind.

Concludes Talks With Baker

LD2609204690 Moscow TASS in English 2034 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Kochetkov, Yevgeniy Menkes, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations September 27 TASS—A meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, which lasted for over three hours, ended here on Wednesday.

The ministers discussed in detail the situation in the Gulf and in the Middle East as a whole and the situation that has formed in the region after the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 670 to tighten sanctions against Iraq.

The talk addressed other regional issues, specifically efforts to settle the conflict in Afghanistan and the Angolan problems.

In discussing disarmament issues, the ministers laid emphasis on the quest for solutions to as yet unresolved issues at the Vienna talks to reduce conventional forces in Europe.

The two politicians also discussed some aspects of the talks on strategic offensive armaments. The considerations of these issues will be continued.

The ministers agreed to meet again during their stay in New York.

Opens Talks With EC Ministers

LD2609203890 Moscow TASS in English 2017 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Kochetkov, Yevgeniy Menkes, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations September 27 TASS—A meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and the foreign ministers of the European Community member-countries began in New York on Wednesday.

The meeting will focus on the unsettled conflicts in the Middle East, specifically in the Persian Gulf, endangering international peace and security.

The ministers will also discuss other regional problems and the development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the EC countries.

Agrees With Statement on Iraq

LD2609224990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2212 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Kochetkov, Yevgeniy Menkes, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations, 27 September TASS—The crisis in the Persian Gulf must be settled urgently, stresses a joint statement by the USSR and the member countries of the European Community, adopted at a meeting held in New York on Wednesday between Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, and the foreign ministers of the European Community countries. This document expresses anxiety that unsettled conflict situations in the Near East and the Persian Gulf create a threat to international peace and security, give rise to new crises, whip up the regional arms race, and lead to an escalation of force and extremism.

Iraq's invasion and military occupation of Kuwait, a sovereign and independent state, have been condemned by the whole world community. One must not reconcile oneself to such actions, since they violate the fundamental principles of the UN Charter and international law and create a new, dangerous center of tension in the region, the document stresses. It contains the demand that Iraq strictly fulfill the resolutions of the UN Security Council and withdraw its troops from Kuwait immediately and unconditionally.

The Soviet Union and the European Community countries declared their determination to continue adhering to the sanctions established by the Security Council, and called on all other states to act in the same way. They expressed readiness to consider additional steps in accordance with the UN Charter.

"Time is not working to the benefit of the aggressor. It is only intensifying the determination of the international community to repel aggression and restore in full the sovereignty of Kuwait," the statement stresses. The Soviet Union and the European Community countries called on the Iraqi authorities to immediately grant all foreign citizens an opportunity to leave Iraq and Kuwait. They consider that the Iraqi Government bears the responsibility for their safety.

The statement notes the firm intention of these countries to intensify efforts to bring about a settlement of other conflicts in the region, such as the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Palestinian problem, and the situation in the Lebanon. "The USSR and member countries of the European community stress their commitment to securing a just, comprehensive, and stable peace in the region in accordance with the relevant resolutions of the UN Security Council," the document says.

At his meeting with the ministers of foreign affairs of West European countries, Eduard Shevardnadze also discussed questions regarding the development of cooperation and links between the USSR and these states.

Confers With Afghan Minister

LD2709080990 Moscow TASS in English 0749 GMT 27 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Kochetkov, Yevgeniy Menkes, and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] United Nations September 27 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze met his Afghan counterpart Abdul Wakil in New York on Wednesday to

discuss efforts to reach a settlement in Afghanistan and measures to promote normalisation in the country.

Although the Gulf crisis has advanced to centre stage in the international arena, it should not delay the resolution of the Afghan problem, the ministers said.

They called for an immediate end to bloodshed in Afghanistan and for peace in the region.

Expanding Soviet-American dialogue, covering very wide spheres of cooperation, including the final settlement in Afghanistan, give a chance to settle the problem, they said.

Improving Soviet-Saudi relations are another positive factor. India and Iran also have a constructive position on the issue, they said.

Wakil told Shevardnadze about the situation in Afghanistan. There has been a decrease in military tensions, he said. Government forces continue to be in control of the situation, thwarting all efforts by the rebels to find a military solution to the Afghan question, he said.

The Afghan Government is now preparing for general elections, a referendum and the final settlement, Wakil continued.

The military situation worsens domestic difficulties, however the government is taking the necessary measures to eliminate food and fuel shortages, he said.

The ministers also discussed various aspects of Soviet-Afghan cooperation.

TASS Reports on Gerasimov's 26 Sep Briefing

Agreement With UN Sanctions

LD2609145590 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The Soviet Union has decided to go along with the world community and condemn Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and to join other members of the Security Council in the United Nations sanctions "out of its own free will, without any pressure, in accordance with new political thinking." Gennadiy Gerasimov told this a briefing when a journalist asked him to comment on the assertions of the Iraqi press that the current Soviet stand with regard to the Gulf events is a result of "U.S. pressure."

Asked if the Soviet Union "intends to conduct a diplomatic dialogue with Iraq in the present situation for the purpose of a peace settlement," the Soviet foreign ministry spokesman said: "We do not break off a dialogue with Iraq. We are prepared for contacts, but these are not negotiations at the expense of others. Iraq should comply with the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council."

Gerasimov was also asked about practical meaning for the USSR of the provisions in Eduard Shevardnadze's speech at the United Nations, where the Soviet minister mentioned multinational forces in the Persian Gulf.

"If we revitalise the Military Staff Committee (of the United Nations—TASS), if the Security Council decides to attach armed forces to it, if we act in the United Nations on the basis of complete accord, this will mean that we shall also participate in the international forces," the spokesman said.

"But there is a need for consensus," he said. In this connection the spokesman said that if the consensus ("the basis on which the United Nations charter was formed") were not disrupted by the cold war, the post-war history would be different, calm.

Gerasimov said that the characteristic feature of the present session of the U.N. General Assembly is that "it takes place against the background of the consensus of the Security Council members as regards Iraq's aggression."

The spokesman said the Iraqi aggression threw light on the fact that the world community is capable of acting jointly. He said the Soviet Union proposes to develop this idea in accordance with the possibilities offered by the United Nations Charter which so far were not put to use.

Iraq's Nuclear Inspection Stand

LD2609163690 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov at today's briefing expressed "certain concern" over Iraq's hint at the 34th session of the general conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) that in view of the concellation of technical assistance by IAEA it may stop cooperation with the agency and will not accept international inspections to monitor operation of Iraqi nuclear plants. As is known, the latest IAEA session that was held from September 17-21 in Vienna discussed the results of the agency's activity last year and set out the tasks for the subsequent two years.

It was stated at IAEA forum that it is necessary to work more actively to involve Israel and South Africa into the Nuclear Non-Profliferation Treaty or to establish the agency's control over their work in the area of nuclear energy, Gerasimov said.

The spokesman said that on the whole the 34th session of IAEA general conference reflected the positive changes in international relations and showed the striving of the overwhelming majority of countries to resolve arising problems in a constructive way, avoiding confrontations.

The forum showed that the events in the Persian Gulf underscored the importance of the development of nuclear power and of control over nuclear non-proliferation.

"The disruption of the existing mechanism of oil supply in the world aggravated the problem of energy sources. Whether one wants it or not, nuclear energy will be the most real source of fuel today and tomorrow," Gerasimov said.

"On the whole, IAEA members showed the growing interest in the consolidation of the agency," Gerasimov said.

Mitterrand's Gulf Proposals

LD2609142290 Moscow TASS in English 1410 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—"Francois Mitterrand's proposals for defusing stage-by-stage the Gulf crisis and solving Middle East problems as a whole are seen as meriting the most serious attention," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov commented at a briefing here today on the French president's speech at the 45th U.N. General Assembly session. The speech is known to have attached much importance to the settlement of the crisis caused by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait.

Gerasimov quoted Mitterrand as saying that any settlement should begin with Iraq's statement on its intention to withdraw its troops from Kuwait and free foreign hostages. "This is fully consistent with our approach and respective U.N. Security Council resolutions in favour of which the Soviet Union is known to have voted," Gerasimov said.

On convening subsequently an international forum to settle the entire range of Middle East problems, Gerasimov recalled that the USSR had been advocating an international conference on the Middle East for many years "as the most correct way of solving the Arab-Israeli conflict and the problems generated by it, and establishing a lasting and fair peace, good neighbourhood and stability there."

Expanded NATO Influence

LD2609143190 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Timofeyev and Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—Recent pronouncements by NATO spokesmen about the advisability of extending the North Atlantic Alliance's sphere of activity to beyond the territories of NATO countries to deal with conflict situations in the Third World arouse "regret," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

Commenting on the interview given to REUTER in connection wit the question by General John Galvin, supreme allied commander of NATO's Armed Forces in Europe, Gerasimov emphasised that such plans "are clearly at variance with the process of the formation of a new multipolar structure of international relations and the transformation of military-political blocs into predominantly political ones."

In this connection Gerasimov recalled that the Soviet Union and the United States jointly pointed out the need for a further enhancement of the role of the United Nations in settling international conflicts.

Gerasimov drew journalists' attention to the Soviet proposal, made at the U.N. General Assembly's third special session on disarmament, to establish a U.N. naval force, and to the Soviet initiative aimed at giving a boost to the activity of the U.N. Military Staff Committee.

"We are convinced that this road accords to the largest extent with the current tendencies of world development while calls to globalise military-political blocs run counter to them," Gerasimov said.

Participation in World Bank

LD2609154490 Moscow TASS in English 1449 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Timofeyev and Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The Soviet Union has accepted an invitation from the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank to take part in the 45th IMF-World Bank joint session, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

The participation of a Soviet delegation in the above-mentioned session is viewed in the Soviet Union within the context of continuation and expansion of official contacts with these institutions.

"We believe that in view of new international relations that are taking shape, conditions have become ripe to begin talks on the Soviet Union's accession to the IMF and the World Bank," Gerasimov emphasised.

The Soviet Union's participation in these organizations is a logical continuation of the policy of large-scale integration of the Soviet Union into the world economic process, he said.

The Soviet Union wants to join the IMF and the World Bank as the bearer of constructive principles, recognising the rules and peculiarities of their functioning that have taken shape over the post-war decades," Gerasimov said.

Publication on Soviet Power

LD2609154990 Moscow TASS in English 1511 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The release of a regular edition of the book entitled "Soviet Military Power" is an evidence that the images of the cold war, which has now been officially buried, are still alive among some U.S. circles, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today in connection with Tuesday's presentation of the Pentagon's annual (ninth) edition in Washington.

The Soviet spokesman told journalists that a similar Soviet entitled "Whence The Threat to Peace?" ran into only four editions and was dropped in 1987.

At the same time, Gerasimov pointed out that the presentation of the Pentagon's edition "was held without the usual pomp." Journalists, for example, did not meet the U.S. secretary of defence.

However, pointing to some positive changes in the Soviet Union, the compilers of the book "Soviet Military Power" are stating that in the eyes of Pentagon strategists the Soviet Union still remains the only adversary capable of destroying the United States.

"There is no doubt that the book requires a thorough study. However, noteworthy are some purely outward attributes of the edition. The outcome of our openness was that journalists without difficulty detected some factual errors in the illustrated material", Gerasimov said.

Relations With Reunited Germany

LD2609181290 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Timofeyev and Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—"A powerful reunited Germany will undoubtedly be our first partner for the scope of cooperation," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

In response to a question about the present state of Soviet-German relations, Gerasimov recalled that a 20-year treaty on goodneighbourly relations, partnership and cooperation between the Soviet Union and West Germany was concluded in Moscow on September 13.

"We regard a reunited Germany as a very promising potential partner in building a common European home," Gerasimov added.

"We are now busy preparing a number of similar treaties with other European states to preclude the impression that Soviet-German rapprochement is evolving at the expense of third countries," Gerasimov pointed out

He said there was agreement with France to begin work to elaborate the text of such a document.

"It is quite likely that similar treaties will be signed with Italy and Britain," Gerasimov said.

Bulgarian Premier's Visit

LD2609134890 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Timofeyev and Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—A detailed discussion of the state of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation took place during talks between Bulgarian Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today. Lukanov arrived in Moscow on Tuesday.

The sides discussed possibilities for refining cooperation between the two countries "on a really equal and mutually beneficial basis," Gerasimov said. Participants in the talks emphasised the importance of a transition to mutual settlements in freely convertible currency, proceeding from world prices, from January 1, 1991.

Lukyanov today also met Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers. Ways to develop direct contacts between the Russian Federation and Bulgaria were discussed, Gerasimov said.

Mediterranean Security Meeting

LD2609143690 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 267 Sep 90

[Text] Madrid September 26 TASS—The Spanish-Italian initiative to call a Mediterranean conference on security and cooperation is being discussed at a forum devoted to problems of the region now under way in Palma de Mallorca. It was called to seek ways to strengthen cooperation, confidence and security in the Mediterranean and to protect its unique environment. It is attended by 35 participants of the CSCE process and by delegates from coastal Arab states and Israel.

A message of greetings from Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze was read out to the forum, stressing that the Soviet Union is ready to contribute both politically and economically to the development of the Mediterranean region.

The meeting may contribute to mutual understanding among CSCE members at their forthcoming summit meeting in Paris, which is expected to be decisive for the future of Europe and the world, the message says.

Head of the Soviet delegation Ambassador Igor Andropov said it was necessary to spread the security concept and positive European reforms to the Mediterranean. The World, Europe and the Mediterranean have reached a turning point. This region is very important for the Soviet Union, since it is crossed by important communication lines.

"The Mediterranean and the Black Sea form a single waterway. This is why we are alarmed by the high level of military confrontation in the region, its uneven development, chronic conflicts, economic crises, acute demography of world development while calls to globalise military-political blocs run counter to them," Gerasimov said.

Cypriot President's Visit

LD2609162490 Moscow TASS in English 1611 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov at a briefing here today set out the Soviet view on the importance of the forthcoming official visit to the Soviet Union by president of Cyprus Georgios Vassiliou.

Referring to a REUTER report of September 25 from New York, the spokesman recalled that the president of Cyprus had a meeting at the United Nations with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and then announced that an arrangement was reached about his official visit to the Soviet Union early in 1991.

The invitation for an official visit to the Soviet Union was conveyed to the president of Cyprus in May 1988, Gerasimov recalled. He said that the Soviet leaders constantly remembered plans for the visit but this question remained unresolved because of a heavy workload of the leaders in connection with the events in the two countries and on the international arena.

"We hope that the forthcoming official visit of President Georgios Vassiliou to the Soviet Union will enrich Soviet-Cyprus relations and cooperation confirmed by the 30 years of friendly bonds between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the Republic of Cyprus," Gerasimov said.

He said that the time frame for the visit will be agreed upon through diplomatic channels.

Relations with Singapore

LD2609143390 Moscow TASS in English 1418 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Timofeyev and Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—"The Soviet Union is satisfied with the results of Singaporean Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew's official visit to the USSR," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

Gerasimov said the visit reflected the growing mutual understanding between the two countries, the deepening political dialogue and mutual desire to develop trade, economic, scientific and technical cooperation. "We value the Singaporean side's readiness to help us implement economic reform," Gerasimov stressed.

Gerasimov noted that Lee Kuan Yew's talks and conversations with the Soviet leadership confirmed that the sides held concurrent view on many pressing international issues, including on the situation in the Persian Gulf.

Gerasimov said the sides extensively discussed the situation in the Asia-Pacific region and the possibility of drawing the USSR more actively in current processes there.

Reports on Nuclear Waste Sites

LD2609165690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1424 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Ivanov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Sep (TASS)—Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, addressing a briefing today, rejected reports that have appeared in Norwegian media to the effect that nuclear waste sites are situated somewhere between Murmansk and the Norwegian border.

Citing information that came from the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman stated that "there are no sites where dumps of such waste are situated in the referent region of Soviet territory."

The diplomat recalled that Kola Nuclear Electric Power Station, with its four units and infrastructure, is situated in this region. "In accordance with the procedures in force, the spent fuel is taken away from the site of the station," said Gennadiy Gerasimov.

Improving Kola Peninsula Ecology

LD2609190290 Moscow TASS in English 1826 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Leonid Timofeyev and Mikhail Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The reconstruction of the metallurgical production plant at the Pechenganickel complex will make it possible to considerably improve the ecological situation in the area of the Kola Peninsula, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

The reconstruction decision was taken by the Soviet Government with due regard for Finland's offer containing terms for the crediting of the planned work, Gerasimov said.

The Soviet and Finnish sides believe that the technology worked out by the Outokumpu firm (Finland) will make it possible to substantially reduce the level of air pollution by sulphur dioxide and other harmful discharges.

The Soviet and Finnish Governments instructed the enterprises and companies concerned to hold technical and commercial negotiations and report results before November 15, this year.

Yakovlev Attends Conference on United Germany

Addresses Forum in Paris

LD2609150490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0648 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Batyrev]

[Excerpts] Paris, 26 Sep (TASS)—The importance of the united Germany for the future of Europe was at the center of attention of the participants in a well-represented international forum "Germany and Europe," which took place in the French capital. [passage omitted]

Unification of Germany became possible only as a consequence of those fundamental constructive changes which developed in Europe within the East-West relations, especially from the mid-eighties, A.N. Yakovlev, member of the USSR Presidential Council, said. These changes are primarily connected with the general restructuring of international relations after 1985. One can talk about the three dimensions of the progressive processes—of which German unification appears to be the distinctive symbol and impulse. First, the division in Europe, which has split the German territory, is being surmounted: The split, which has reflected not only, and even not as much as the confrontation of the two systems, but also the experience, political and psychological results of the two world wars.

Second, there has been considerable progress in surmounting the East-West divide on a worldwide scale. We were able to find ways toward trust and cooperation, the process of disarmament began to gather pace. Europe has acquired a new character. We will all be different from what we were in the past when we come to the future boundaries. What significance will this have for Europe?

And the third plan: Europe will get a real chance for renaissance at a new twist of the spiral and in a new capacity, the main distinctive feature of which is unity in diversity. Evolution of Europe has arrived at that stage when all of us are capable to see in its diversity not the reason for confrontation, but an incentive for cooperation, mutual benefits. This is precisely what gives us reasons to put on the European political agenda the establishment of the common military, political, social, economic, legal and humanitarian entity, where the sovereign states would cooperate fruitfully.

During a meeting between the Soviet participants and French President Mitterrand, questions of mutual interests were discussed. The guests from the USSR also met L. Fabius, the chairman of the French National Assembly. A.N. Yakovlev met French Prime Minister M. Rocard. In the course of their conversation a wide range of problems, including the present international situation, the situation in the USSR, and the prospects for Soviet-French relations, were discussed. A meeting with J. Delors, the chairman of the European Commission, which was devoted mainly to possibilities of expanding USSR contracts with the European Community in the light of the current changes in the Soviet Union, also took place.

Discusses Relations With France

LD2609215990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev, member of the Presidential Council, has attended the European public forum "Germany and Europe," which has been taking place in Paris.

[Correspondent S. Iyezuitov] Late yesterday evening, Aleksandr Yakovlev met French Prime Minister Michel Rocard. The sides discussed a wide range of issues. They included the world situation, the position in the Soviet Union, and the prospects for developing relations with France.

On the same day, there was a meeting with Jacques Delors, chairman of the Commission of the European Communities. The possibilities for broadening the USSR's ties with the European Community in light of the transformations taking place in our country formed the main topic under discussion.

Aleksandr Nikolayevich Yakovlev gave a brief interview for Soviet Television on the results of his stay in france.

[Begin recording] [Iyezuitov] As is known, major European newspapers were the initiators of the holding of this symposium, the sponsors, as it were. What idea did they instil into the holding of these meetings regarding the prospects for the unification of Germany—a question, in other words, that is already practically resolved?

[Yakovlev] I think that the source of the interest that European newspapers have shown is the fact that there are very different attitudes toward the problem of the unification of Germany, [ranging] from fear, from panic, from criticism, to caution, to enthusiasm. Clearly, it is not the edges here that lend themselves to description, although in the middle there is a kind of positive caution, I would say, which is, in general, essential. And this became very clear at the symposium.

[Iyezuitov] One other question. You had a very tight schedule, yet you found the time to meet representatives of the French leadership and representatives of the parties. What is the main result of these meetings?

[Yakovlev] I think it is hard to cite any concrete information about the results of such meetings. But I would highlight the meetings—well, first—with President Mitterrand, who once again confirmed the French leadership's firm intention to develop Soviet-French relations and to maintain them at a priority level. Apart from that, there was a very interesting meeting with France's prime minister. There was a very interesting conversation with Delors. He has been to Moscow. He is a well-known personality. He said that, in the near future, he will be presenting the leaders of the twelve governments, the twelve countries, with his proposals, his report, on how to proceed with building up economic cooperation with the Soviet Union, and he personally takes quite an optimistic view of the matter.

Bogachev Questions Continued Need for NATO

LD2609113590 Moscow TASS in English 1123 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—Nobody in the West now doubts the need for the reform of the North Atlantic Alliance. What the debate is about are the scope and direction of the changes.

U.S. President George Bush declared after the NATO session in London that the West was changing in response to reforms in the Soviet Union. NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner noted that the West should reform in order to adequately meet the challenge posed by current changes.

Many Western analysts doubt the need for NATO at a time when the Soviet Union is withdrawing its troops from Eastern Europe and cutting its armed forces, when the Warsaw Treaty is revising its functions in order to turn the bloc into a political alliance. What is NATO for, if there is no more "enemy in the East"?

There are other observers, however, who believe that in the new conditions NATO should merely present the public, which doubts the need for burdensome military spending when there is no more cold war, with a more attractive image.

Former British defence secretary Michael Heseltine, who contributed substantially in his days to the fanning up of Soviet military threat hysteria, now fears lest the absence of an "enemy image" should lead to NATO's disintegration.

NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe U.S. General John Galvin favours the expansion of NATO's "zone of responsibility" beyond the territory of its 16 members. Obviously trying to prove that NATO's military functions are not superfluous, Glavin claims that the strengthening of the alliance's southern flank, primarily in Turkey, is particularly important. He calls for special task forces to be formed not only on the southern, but also on northern NATO flanks.

U.S. Secretary of Defence Richard Cheney has announced America's and NATO's new military strategy. It no longer envisages a global war against the Soviet Union, but stresses military preparedness for regional conflicts. It is still premature to speak about the true importance of Washington's decision, because in the same statement Cheney said the U.S. was set on continuing the SDI programme and developing sophisticated strategic armaments, which can hardly be intended for settling regional conflicts.

The Warsaw Treaty nations and NATO have declared their intention to strengthen the two alliances' political components. Discernible here, however, are two tendencies in determining the role of blocs in maintaining peace and stability in Europe.

NATO leaders have reaffirmed the "immutability of NATO's fundamental tasks", which have so far been predominantly military. They stress that NATO should remain the "cornerstone" of the new order on the European continent, while international organisations, including the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), will only supplement NATO's functions.

The Soviet Union, on the other hand, favours the raising of CSCE's role in solving European problems and calls for reducing the role of military alliances. It moves to set up several new institutions within the CSCE, which could make the dialogue among the 35 member-nations more efficient and orderly.

NATO's statement that the Western alliance has no aggressive intentions vis-a-vis East European nations has been received with satisfaction in the Soviet Union. It hopes that the declaration issued by the NATO session will be confirmed by the West's active cooperation in the creation of new political structures for ensuring Europe's security.

Belgium Blocks NATO Air Defense System Plan

PM2409104190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent V. Peresada: "Belgian 'Surprise'"]

[Excerpts] Brussels, 20 Sep—Belgium had a "surprise" in store for the North Atlantic Alliance. National Defense Minister Guy Coeme stated his refusal to sign the research program geared to creating an up-to-date NATO air defense command and control system.

This means not only that Belgium itself is obstructing the project. Since the NATO agency that is devoloping the project is located in Brussels, the local defense minister is authorized by NATO, as the "host," to sanction all

essential contracts. Guy Coeme's decision not to sign the program as such blocks its implementation altogether, although other NATO countries have given it the green light, the paper LE DRAPEAU ROUGE writes.

The Belgian minister explained his step in a letter to the NATO secretary general. Noting that the research work will be very costly, he stressed: "There can be no question of my agreeing to pointless expenditure, since the projected program totally ignores the changes in Eastern Europe." [passage omitted]

It seems to me that the decision made in Brussels could be a touchstone that will demonstrate once again to what extent the NATO leadership's words and actions correspond. After all, if, as has been said in many alliance declarations, the "threat from the East" in Europe has effectively disappeared, then why improve the air defense system?

NATO Commander Galvin Slated To Visit USSR

PM2609151590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

["TASS, REUTER, and UPI Report": "First Time in NATO History"]

[Text] U.S. General John Galvin, NATO supreme allied commander, has announced his intention of paying a visit to Moscow this November. It will be the first visit of this kind in the history of the North Atlantic bloc.

Soviet Delegates Attend IMF, World Bank Session

LD2609102290 Moscow TASS in English 1014 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Matyash]

[Text] Washington September 26 TASS—An annual session of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) opened here on Tuesday. It is attended by representatives of 152 countries.

A Soviet delegation is present for the first time in the history of these major international financial organisations. It is led by Chairman of the Board of the USSR State Bank Viktor Gerashchenko and includes representatives of the State Foreign Economic Commission under the USSR Council of Ministers, Foreign Economic Bank and Board for International Economic Relations under the Soviet Foreign Ministry.

President of the World Bank Barber Conable, who opened the forum, urged international financial institutions to render urgent aid to hundreds of thousands of refugees—victims of Iraq's invasion of Kuwait—to grant them easy loans and credits as quickly as possible. He referred primarily to countries affected by the rapidly rising prices of oil extracted in the Gulf area.

Former U.S. Deputy Secretary of State for Economic and Business Affairs Robert Hormats, one of the session's sponsors, told TASS he favoured granting the Soviet Union membership of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

He believes these bodies could help Soviet reforms by providing technological and financial advice and permanent consultations. They may render assistance in setting up a new banking and financial system, envisaged in Shatalin's plan, Hormets noted. He believes the Soviet Union also needs the World Bank's assistance in reforming Soviet agriculture.

After all, a third of this year's bumper crop was lost on its way from the fields to the consumers, he said. "We could help organise a modern telephone system in the USSR. Perestroyka's success undoubtly meets our interests, and therefore it is important to expand all-round cooperation with the Soviet Union," Hormats said.

The session was addressed by President George Bush. He called for broader international cooperation and assistance to Soviet reforms.

Nishanov Meets European Council Delegation

LD2109161390 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 21 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 21 TASS—European nations need broad cooperation to overcome the gap between Eastern and Western Europe, it was agreed during today's meeting between Chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the Soviet Parliament Rafik Nishanov and a delegation of the European Council led by the director of its legal deparment Eric Harremos.

The guests wished to know how socio-economic and inter-ethnic problems were solved in the Soviet Union. They were provided with the necessary information.

Soviet Academician Attends Pugwash Conference

Goldanskiy Outlines Goals

PM2509104790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent A. Krivopalov: "New Concerns of Pugwash Committee"]

[Text] London—The great Rodin would probably not have objected to this use of his sculptural masterpiece: His "Thinker" graced a publication of the 40th Pugwash Conference with the topical caption beneath the drawing: "Thinking Afresh."

Indeed, this authoritative forum of world scientists and political experts gathered in the city of Egham near London took place under the sign of the new thinking. Actually, it was this movement, inspired by A. Einstein and B. Russell, which perhaps gave the first global philosophical lesson in the quest for peace and security. The work of the international meeting, which lasted a week, has just ended. Here is what Academician V.I.

Goldanskiy, chairman of the Soviet Pugwash Committee, told your IZVESTIYA correspondent about its results:

[Goldanskiy] From its inception the movement proclaimed the priority of general human values. The Einstein-Russell manifesto stressed: Nuclear war threatens the universal destruction of mankind. This statement not seems absolutely obvious, even trivial to us now.

In our day (this was particularly noted at the 40th Pugwash Conference) it has become obvious that the USSR and the United States simply cannot wage a nuclear war against each other.

[Krivopalov] In Egham you sat on plenary sessions and in working groups while the dangerous development of events generated by Iraq's aggressive actions was continuing in the Persian Gulf region. I think the question of the international arms trade could not have failed to attract your colleagues' attention?

[Goldanskiy] Of course this was mentioned openly: It is necessary to drastically restrict it and put it under control. To use a well-known idiomatic expression, everyone has a finger in the pie here. And it was directly noted at the conference that now everyone one way or another must taste the fruit of his nearsighted policy.

After all, it was precisely in the search for the most vulnerable spot, seeking to wound our rival as painfully as possible, under the influence of the "image of the enemy," that special "friends" and "allies" appeared. Also, this did not apply to just one country. There were various stages. At a certain moment we helped Iraq more; in other periods, for instance during the Iraq-Iran war, the Americans and others noticeably did the same.

[Krivopalov] I have heard that those present were greatly impressed by the reports delivered at the plenary session by a number of eminent participants in the conference, in particular former U.S. Defense Secretary R. McNamara?

[Goldanskiy] Yes, that is so. It must be said that in general public statements reflect a new tendency in the Pugwash movement, which used to prefer discussion in a narrower circle, without going out to the masses. As for McNamara, he recalled in particular the Atlantic Charter proclaimed in 1941 by F. Roosevelt and W. Churchill, when the anti-Hitler coalition was already in operation. This eminent American figure stressed that the principles proclaimed in that declaration began to be asserted only in our day thanks to the present revolutionary transformations in the USSR. In his opinion, over the next few years a halving of U.S. military expenditure is possible.

[Krivopalov] What new topics arose during the discussions at the conference?

[Goldanskiy] In 1995, as is well known, the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons expires and whether it will be extended is still problematical. Although the Pugwash movement does not engage in the internal affairs of states, this forum voiced the opinion that it is necessary to discuss the dangers connected with the instability of the countries with nuclear weapons and nuclear power stations. We also had in mind the tendencies which are appearing in our country, for instance. It is one thing when a federation or confederation of republics arises which delegates powers in the military field to a central government or Union and another when each arrogates this right. Where will our nuclear forces be concentrated in that case? In the Russian Federation? Then it will be one of the world's five nuclear powers. Or will these forces be scattered to various corners, and what will be the result? This prospect is already causing alarm...

Nuclear-Free Zones Supported

PM2609130590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent A. Lyutyy: "Brainstorming: 40th Pugwash Conference Ends in Egham"]

[Text] London, 23 Sep—You sometimes hear people say that scientists urged the reduction and removal of nuclear weapons for several decades, but all their appeals remained a voice in the wilderness. The deadlock was broken only thanks to the wisdom of politicians. So how great is the influence of scientists upon international policy?

The argument on this topic now seems purely academic. Scientists, who possess a vast stock of knowledge, have considerably helped politicians to perceive and all of us to become aware of the dangers of our nuclear age. The organization which plays a special role in this educational work is the Pugwash movement, which was born in 1957. Its vigorous activity helped spur the signing of the treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons in three areas in 1963 and the conclusion of the treaty on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons in 1968.

The five-day brainstorming session in Egham was concerned with such problems as the widening gulf between the developed North and the poor South, the worsening of regional conflicts, economic development and the threat of environmental degradation, and the prospects for Europe in the 21st century. And although the sessions of the eight working parties were closed to the public, the participants shared certain of their conclusions at the final press conference.

Academician V. Goldanskiy, chief of the Soviet delegation, noted that the task of turning the planet into a nuclear-free zone set by the movement could be solved in stages. Initially Europe or, for the time being, just its central section, including united Germany, should be declared such a zone.

One participant called for a detailed study of operational questions concerned with the idea of creating peacekeeping forces within the CSCE mechanism. The conflict

in the Persian Gulf has prompted the Pugwash movement to appreciate the need to introduce a nonproliferation regime in the sphere of weapons sales. And Britain's Lord Flowers proposed concluding an international convention banning hostage-taking.

It may be that some of the Pugwash participants' ideas will seem utopian. But Prof. S. Kapitsa aptly remarked on this score: "There is a now a great demand for new ideas, even new idealism. Otherwise we will have more and more irrationalism."

The next Pugwash meeting will take place in China in 1991.

Mayorov Criticizes Arms Supplies Policies

LD2609011490 Moscow in Portuguese to Africa 1800 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Excerpts] To date, no official data has ever been published in the USSR on which countries receive Soviet arms supplies, nor on the amount of the latter, even though the crisis in the Persian Gulf ought to prompt the Ministry of Defense to put its cards on the table, so to speak. After all, you can hardly treat as a state secret that which the overwhelming majority of the people, if not all of the people, have already guessed. Worst of all, dissembling can only do further damage to our prestige, should it turn out that we have supplied weapons to an aggressor.

This is the premise for the following commentary by Mikhail Mayorov:

It is very hard to raise this subject with those people in the Third World who are now perceiving Moscow as having turned its back on them. They judge the matter as follows: The USSR was taking a correct stance when it supported with weapons supplies its friends in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. If now Moscow stops its supplies of Kalashnikovs to those who want them, it will behave as a renegade by ceasing to support its friends.

This logic undoubtedly has a flaw: For some unknown reason its definition of "support" practically excludes diplomacy. And yet, there were instances when no amount of submachine guns could do as much to eliminate a hot spot as the goodwill of all the interested parties, the USSR and the United States included. [passage omitted]

The question arises: Do arms supplies stabilize a situation in a given part of the world? Of do they arouse baser instincts in the leaders, seemingly convincing them that the imported weaponry justifies their claims on neighboring countries, or possibly on the entire world.

Iraq's aggression against little Kuwait was unexpected for many, possibly for the overwhelming majority of the people. But it was not unexpected for those who realized the inevitability of what happened. It is a pity that the list of such prophets did not include any of those responsible for Soviet policy in the Middle East, for whom the concepts of "foreign friend" and "weapons end-user" meant one and the same thing.

You can learn from life's experiences, even from the bitter ones. It may well be that some day soon the Ministry of Defense will lay its cards on the table and a radical decision will be made that no more Kalashnikovs will ever again leave the USSR—for the sake of our own interests, and indeed of the interests of those whose fingers would be on their triggers, Mikhail Mayorov writes in conclusion.

Ambassadors to Cambodia, Ethiopia Replaced

PM2109142590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed "Chronicle" report]

[Text] The USSR president has appointed Yuriy Nikolayevich Myakotnykh USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the State of Cambodia.

The USSR president has relieved Rashit Luftulovich Khamidulin of the post of USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the State of Cambodia on his reassignment.

The USSR president has appointed Lev Davydovich Mironov ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.

The USSR president has relieved Valentin Ivanovich Dmitriyev of the post of USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the People's Democratic Republic of Ethiopia upon his retirement.

International Journalists Center Set To Open

PM2409131790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Report by G. Dzhokhadze: "Journalists of All Countries Unite"]

[Text] An international journalists center has been created in Moscow.

The center does not have its own premises yet, but a group of journalists helping to establish this unusual organization has already been formed.

The center will bring together Soviet and foreign journalists accredited in the USSR and intends to help those journalists in the country persecuted for their convictions.

The international journalists center will publish its own newspaper and receive income from advertising in the press and in its own television program.

United States & Canada

Pentagon's 1990 Report on Soviet Power Assailed

Termed Attempt To Kindle Cold War

LD2609212290 Moscow TASS in English 2042 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—The Pentagon has made a fresh attempt to kindle the cold-war spirit among American taxpayers. The 1990 edition of "Soviet Military Power" released by the Defence Department on Tuesday abounds with cliches of the times of the Berlin and Caribbean crises—"Soviet military menace", "banking on the first-strike potential", etc.

The Pentagon leaders should be given credit. They realise that in present-day conditions it would be futile to try to intimidate Americans with "reliable" data about Soviet plans to penetrate NATO defence in Europe and reach the Atlantic within a week. Times have changed, and such assertions will not be believed. What is more, a Pentagon spokesman said at a briefing in Washington that "the report looks at both the good news about Soviet military power as well as what you might call the bad news."

Indeed, while rehashing allegations about "the Soviet menace," the authors of the report mention that cuts in the Soviet Armed Forces, Soviet troop withdrawal from East European countries and the lessening of chances of an outbreak of war in Europe.

But, the main thing, in the new military-political situation in the world, the authors of the report draw conclusions which differ little from the postulates of the cold-war times. They assert that the United States faces the threat of the Soviet Union which has formidable military might. They infer that the best way to meet to the challenge is to maintain a high combat preparedness of the U.S. Armed Forces which, naturally, necessitates appropriations for military needs.

The Pentagon report asserts that the Soviet Union remains the only power in the world capable of destroying the United States and its allies. But does the Soviet Union feel more secure for the reason that aside from the United States, Great Britain and France are capable of dealing nuclear strikes at its territory? It is apparent that the Pentagon uses double standards again and again.

In the preface to the report, Defence Secretary Richard Cheney writes that there are undoubtedly reasons for optimism regarding the future of the Soviet military threat. By this he apparently means that the Soviet menace persists, so the U.S. Congress should appropriate more billions of dollars for military needs.

The very fact that the United States continues to issue the Defence Department's annual reports on "Soviet Military Power" bespeaks of the Pentagon's intention to continue propaganda against the Soviet Union even in new conditions. Incidentally, the USSR Defence Ministry terminated the publication of its booklets "Whence the Threat to Peace" in 1987.

Lack of Objectivity Seen

LD2709010490 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] On Tuesday, the Pentagon brought out this year's report titled" "Soviet Military Power." Vladislav Kozyakov has the details:

The authors of the report admit that the Soviet Union's reduction of military spendings in armaments reflects the new political thinking of the Soviet leaders. They cite American estimates of the Soviet cuts in the production of such weapons as tanks, artillery pieces, and multiple rocket launchers. They also report on the Soviet arms and troops' pullout from Eastern Europe and Mongolia. Unlike the previous issues of the report the present issue concentrates on the implementation of the Soviet Union's new defensive military doctrine. Other sections of the report are dealing with the disarmament process started off by the recent Soviet-American agreements.

Of the report's many photographs, each picture of a Soviet weapon or weapon system is virtually matched by a photo of some missile, bomber, or armored vehicle being dismantled as part of arms reductions programs. As they note the changes that have taken place in the world over the past year the authors of the report seem to have good reason to say: the likelihood of a conflict stemming from United States-Soviet confrontation is lower than it has ever been in the post-war era.

But, even this report contains some of the biased statements which marked the previous eight issues. In estimating the Soviet chemical arsenals, which are to be eliminated under an agreement with the United States, it omits the fact that Moscow, unlike Washington, has long ended the production of chemical weapons, and the following extract from the report brings to mind the cold war times: the Soviets, the report says, continue to improve technologies which are being harnessed to improve military potential of biological warfare stocks. That, and similar statements, are apparently aimed to raise doubts as to the Soviet defense policies.

In the preface to the report, Defense Secretary Richard Cheney is using such hackneyed terms as the Soviet threat. The Pentagon leaders refers to the Soviet nuclear and other forces, which he claims are threatening the Americans. But doesn't the Pentagon keep similar forces threatening the Soviet Union? It would be better to say that both the Soviet Union and the United States possess an excessive military power and then recall the importance of disarmament accords.

A Washington observer has noted that in a departure from past practice, Richard Cheney did not personally

present the report at a news conference. His spokesman, Peter Williams, said Cheney's decision reflected in part United States appreciation of Soviet cooperation in the effort to force Iraq out of Kuwait. Even so, one can deplore the fact that the report fails to note the full scale of relations between Moscow and Washington, which are marked by growing trust, cooperation within the United Nations, and partnership. These new trends call for an objective coverage of each other's policies. And such coverage is sadly missing from many pages of the Pentagon's report.

U.S. Senate Ratifies Nuclear Test Agreement

LD2609092690 Moscow TASS in English 0915 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington September 26 TASS—The U.S. Senate ratified two Soviet-American agreements on Tuesday—to limit the yield of underground nuclear tests and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. It also approved the corresponding protocols.

The agreements were signed in 1974 and 1976 respectively and limit the maximum permissible yield of nuclear tests and peaceful explosions to 150 kilotonnes.

Although the agreements have been observed by both sides, they remained unratified due to differences on verification procedures. In November 1987 the Soviet Union and the United States got down to talks on control procedures and drafted protocols on verification measures. They were signed by the Soviet and American presidents on June 1 during the Washington summit.

Northeast Asia

IZVESTIYA Cited for 'Hindering' of Korean Unity

SK2709063090 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Report on an article by (Rukashin), IZVESTIYA's correspondent in the DPRK]

[Text] On 11 September, IZVESTIYA, a Soviet newspaper, carried an article by reporter Yusin entitled: Seoul and Moscow Are Ready To Establish Diplomatic Relations. The author wrote in his article that the foreign media had reported that diplomatic relations would be established between the Soviet Union and South Korea in the near future. In connection with this, (Rukashin), IZVESTIYA's correspondent in the DPRK, reports:

Regrettably, IZVESTIYA's article made Pyongyang impatient. On 19 September, MINJU CHOSON, the government's newspaper, carried a commentary entitled: An Act of Hindering Korea's Reunification. In its commentary, the newspaper expressed its strong displeasure with IZVESTIYA and our country.

For example, the commentary said: IZVESTIYA, a Soviet newspaper, in assessing the Pyongyang talks between the DPRK and Soviet foreign ministers, pointed out that the Soviet Union would establish diplomatic relations with South Korea. This means that the Soviet Union would join in the attempt to fabricate two Koreas. This will aggravate the pains and misfortune that our people are suffering because of the national division.

The commentary also said: However, IZVESTIYA wrote that the Soviet Union establishes diplomatic relations depending on its own interests and that it is a matter for the Soviet Union itself, a sovereign state, to decide without asking for anyone else's approval.

While making a (?typical), uncourteous comment, MINJU CHOSON also said that the IZVESTIYA article was of a dirty nature.

We are not trying to argue with the Korean reporter [the author of the MINJU CHOSON commentary]. All the issues and demands that the Korean reporter stated are issues that diplomats must discuss. However, there is something that the author of MINJU CHOSON, the DPRK Government's newspaper, must know.

We note the allegation that the Soviet Union is responsible for Korea's division after World War II. We did not want Korea's division. We would like to recall what Comrade Kim Il-song said.

He said: The heroic Red Army of the Soviet Union drove out the Japanese militarists and gave freedom and independence to the Korean people. Bright roads opened for the righteous Korean people.

It is regrettable that an official of the Korean Government's newspaper did not know what the president of his country said.

The author of the commentary forgot another point, too. That is, the Soviet Union has so far positively supported the DPRK's proposal to turn the Korean peninsula into a nuclear-free zone and the Korean people's struggle to peacefully reunify the fatherland.

IZVESTIYA reporters have had friendly working relations with the MINJU CHOSON reporters for a long time. Then, what led the DPRK Government's newspaper to make such a strange and, frankly speaking, uncourteous response? This still remains a mystery.

Primakov, Japanese Parliamentarian View Ties

OW2609124590 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Excerpts] A symposium was held in Moscow on 23 September as part of the events surrounding Japanese culture week. The theme of the symposium was: Views on Soviet-Japanese and Japanese-Soviet Cooperation and Exchanges.

Participating in the symposium were well-known politicians, scholars, and economists from both the Soviet Union and Japan. A 58-member parliamentary delegation from Japan's Liberal Democratic Party also participated, making this the first time in the history of Soviet-Japanese relations that so many parliamentarians participated in such a symposium.

At the opening of the symposium, Primakov, an academician and member of the Soviet Presidential Council, and Keizo Obuchi, a member of the Japanese House of Representatives, delivered keynote speeches.

Now we will hear excerpts from these two speeches. Academician Primakov said:

Relations between the two countries have improved somewhat recently. But it may be said that while there are many positive efforts being made in international relations, Soviet-Japanese bilateral relations have been left out of many of these positive processes. Indeed a comparison cannot be made between relations between the two countries and relations now developing at a great speed between the Soviet Union and the United States or between the Soviet Union and West European nations.

To our regret, what can be said conclusively is that the Soviet-Japanese relationship is not able to mirror positive changes taking place in the region. The current situation in relations between the two countries can be explained as such.

About prospects for Soviet-Japanese relations, I must say frankly that there are two myths that need to be overcome. These myths have affected perceptions by the countries' politicians, scholars, and businessmen for a very long time. We have to eradicate these myths.

These myths have rather discouraged activities between the two countries and have, [words indistinct] unconsciously and intuitively, resulted in negative ways of thinking.

The first myth is that many Soviets are believed to have great interests in the resources of Siberia and the Far East. The other myth is that, as so many Japanese think, the Soviet Union, concerned about improving productivy in areas east of the Urals and in the Far East, eventually will make concessions on (?territories) in return for assistance in science, technology, and finance. According to this myth, the Soviet Union, hoping to raise productivity in the region, has no other choice but to do so. These two myths do not correspond to reality, even though on the other hand it would be incorrect to conclude that the two nations are not interested in improving bilateral relations.

Academician Primakov, then, spoke on the question of territories as follows:

The question of sovereignty over the four Kurile Islands should not be emphasized. Debates on sovereignty will only drive us to a very difficult impasse. That is because most people in both nations—the Sovet Union and Japan—will not yield on their positions on the matter. Ways to get out of this impasse, however, apparently lie elsewhere. Now is the time to exchange views on the question of how all the differing positions on the issue of the Kurile Islands should be settled, without touching on the question of sovereignty.

In connection with this, discussions should also be held on how the two countries might conduct joint economic activities, on various military and political issues, and on other various problems. By doing so, we will be able to relieve tensions in the dispute over the territories and to open a door toward further improvement of Soviet-Japanese relations in politics, economics, science and technology, and culture. With such developments in Soviet-Japanese relations, we would be able to step into a period in which both countries can solve other problems, the solutions of which are thought to be impossible.

There is no doubt that President Gorbachev's upcoming visit to Japan will be an epoch-making event and will mark a significant turning point toward improved bilateral ties. It is well known throughout the world that many major problems were solved when the Soviet president visited foreign countries or when summit talks were held in the Soviet Union. However, I would like to caution against predictions spreading or being spread intentionally in Tokyo. For example, there is speculation that President Gorbachev may solve various pending problems between the Soviet Union and Japan by unilaterally abandoning past Soviet positions or that President Gorbachev may present several proposals to the Japanese side and ask it to indicate which are acceptable. Such speculation, based on hopes, are unrealistic. The Soviet Union and Japan should construct their future while searching for an area in which we can combine the interests of both countries. It is important that the balance of interests is maintained.

This is what Academician Primakov, a member of the Soviet Presidential Council, pointed out.

Now, you will hear comments by former Chief Cabinet Secretary Keizo Obuchi, leader of the visiting Japanese delegation. He said:

[Begin Obuchi recording] It is regrettable that Shintaro Abe, who has been devoting so much of his enthusiasm to improving ties and expanding exchanges between Japan and the Soviet Union, is not able to attend this event. I would like to report on the views of the Japanese side, including those of Mr. Abe. First of all, I would like to speak about perestroyka in the Soviet Union. With the 21st century only ten years away, the international situation is changing dramatically changing. These changes were unexpected only a few years ago, even among people with insight into the future. Japanese-Soviet relations also cannot [words indistinct] against this big current of changes. [passage omitted]

The so-called eight-item exchange plan aimed at promoting Japanese-Soviet cooperation and exchanges is a

concrete proposal. This eight-item exchange plan has produced results. We are truly pleased that the large-scale events for Japanese Culture Week are now held in Moscow, Leningrad, and other places. [passage omitted]

The Japanese Government considers the conclusion of a peace treaty with the Soviet Union as a very high priority task, and hence is making its best efforts to solve problems. [passage indistinct] [end recording]

Ryzhkov Greets New Mongolian Prime Minister

PM2509135390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Message from Soviet Premier N. Ryzhkov to Mongolian Premier Dashiyan Byambsuren]

[Text] To Mongolian Prime Minister Comrade Dashiyn Byambasuren:

I congratulate you on your appointment as Mongolian prime minister.

People in the Soviet Union are convinced that the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Mongolia are gaining considerably from the processes of perestroyka and renewal taking place in our countries.

I wish you and the entire Mongolian people success in building humane democratic socialism.

(Signed) N. Ryzhkov

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Singapore Prime Minister Continues Moscow Visit

Visit Termed 'Major Milestone'

PM2609103590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Soviet-Singapore Talks"]

[Text] Talks were held 24 September in the Kremlin between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Singapore Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit. The talks covered a wide range of questions of bilateral relations and also topical problems of the world political process, with the emphasis on the situation in the Asian and Pacific region.

N.I. Ryzhkov noted that Lee Kuan Yew's visit to the USSR is a major milestone on the path of the development of relations between the two countries, which are acquiring a new quality. It makes it possible to lend new impetus to bilateral cooperation. The present meeting is a continuation of the substantive dialogue which has been proceeding increasingly dynamically since the meeting early this year in Singapore between the heads of the two countries' governments.

For his part Lee Kuan Yew stressed that Singapore is following with great sympathy the implementation of the ideas of perestroyka in the USSR, which are exerting substantial influence on the international situation as a whole. The head of the Singapore government wished the Soviet leadership fruitful work on the implementation of the tasks facing it, pointing out that this work's success is important not only for the Soviet Union but also for the whole world, which is experiencing the process of transition from division into blocs to the era of interdependence and integration.

In this connection the Singapore prime minister displayed, on the conceptual and philosophical plane, great interest in the major changes taking place in the Soviet economy.

The sides paid special attention to the question of the interconnection of socioeconomic development within the framework of individual national states and the overall complex of world economic relations, noting that global problems require active collaboration and cooperation between all states of the world community. Lee Kuan Yew voiced the opinion that even at the present stage of socioeconomic transformations in the USSR the world community of states could render real support in the process of the transition to market relations in the economy.

N.I. Ryzhkov provided thorough information on transformations in our country and on the progress in elaborating a program for the transition to the market system of economic management making it possible not only to resolve internal economic problems but also to become an organic part of the international division of labor.

In that context the heads of government exchanged opinions on ways of building up Soviet-Singapore economic cooperation and on the urgency of the search for new forms and mechanisms of this development meeting modern requirements.

Both sides noted the importance of uncovering the great potential of the Soviet Far East and its speediest inclusion in the processes of the international division of labor in the Asian-Pacific region. The Singapore prime minister voiced readiness to promote the implementation of this aim.

The discussion of international problems showed that on a wide range of questions the USSR and Singapore adhere to close views and positions. N.I. Ryzhkov set forth our view of the important positive changes which have been taking place in the world arena recently and noted the substantial breakthrough in the direction of the normalization of the international climate. The sides agreed that the world community's efforts should now be concentrated on consolidating the departure from conflict in states' foreign policies and the search for a

balance in the interests of all participants in international life. Important significance attaches to the all-around enhancement of the United Nations' role in resolving fundamental international problems and settling conflict situations.

The heads of the USSR and Singapore governments expressed profound concern at the Persian Gulf situation. They believe that Iraq's occupation of Kuwait not only runs counter to general peace tendencies but also presents a grave threat to peace and security in the Persian Gulf zone, which is fraught with very dangerous consequences for the international situation. The Singapore prime minister assessed highly the Soviet Union's position in connection with the events in the Persian Gulf and the joint steps by the USSR and the United States to overcome the crisis. Both sides noted the urgency of the speediest settlement of the entire complex of Near East problems.

During their exchange of opinions on the situation in the Asian-Pacific region, N.I. Ryzhkov noted the development here of positive processes which are promoting the improvement of interstate relations and the general political atmosphere in that very large part of the world and also noted the start of the search for ways of strengthening regional security and cooperation.

The participants in the talks expressed themselves in favor of the speediest political solution of the Afghan problem with the active participation of the United Nations and noted with satisfaction the serious progress in attaining an all-embracing political settlement on Cambodia.

N.I. Ryzhkov and Lee Kuan Yew expressed satisfaction at the talks which had taken place and which had passed in a spirit of frankness and constructiveness.

The following took part in the talks: on the Soviet side S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.L. Malkevich, chairman of the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry; I.A. Rogachev, USSR deputy foreign minister; V.F. Mordvinov, USSR deputy minister of foreign economic relations; and N.N. Loginov, USSR ambassador to Singapore; on the Singapore side Goh Chok Tong, first deputy prime minister and minister of defense of Singapore; Professor S. Jayakumar, minister of justice and home affairs; Wong Kan Seng, minister of foreign affairs and public development; Mah Bow Tan, minister of state for communications and information and minister of state for trade and industry; and J.F. Conceicao, Singapore ambassador to the USSR.

Lee Kuan Yew Meets Gorbachev

LD2609223990 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Bezbrezhny and Nikolay Kondratenko]

[Text] Leningrad September 27 TASS—Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew of Singapore described his meeting with President Mikhail Gorbachev as being characterised by a high degree of amicability on the latter's part. It is only in this way that one can appreciate the fact that the Soviet president found time to meet him, considering his major involvement in the intense work of parliament, Lee Kuan Yew said.

The prime minister of Singapore has been in the Soviet Union on an official visit since Monday at the invitation of the Soviet government. He held a news conference in Leningrad today for Singapore and Soviet journalists who cover his visit.

Speaking of his Tuesday meeting with the Soviet president in Moscow, he noted its unconstrained and informal nature. This is yet another illustration of democratic changes in the Soviet Union, the guest said.

In response to questions concerning various aspects of reforms in the USSR, Lee Kuan Yew emphasised the profoundly democratic nature of perestroyka as a whole. It would be find for both the Soviet Union and the world if perestroyka is crowned with success. He said.

Speaking about Singapore-Soviet economic cooperation, Lee Kuan Yew favoured a long-term nature of this cooperation, voicing hope that the projected reforms will help the Soviet economy integrate into the world economy.

It is now essential to help the Soviet economy, the prime minister said. Anyone who believes that one should wait will lose his opportunities. The plane on which I flew to Moscow from london was full of Moscow-bound British businessmen, he said.

The guest made a trip to the city of Pushkin.

Near East & South Asia

UN Adopts Resolution on Air Blockade of Iraq

LD2609172990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0915 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Sep TASS—The UN Security Council almost unanimously adopted a resolution on an air blockade of Iraq. Once more the unity of the international community's member states, unprecedented in the postwar period in their confrontation to an aggressor, has been affirmed. And not only the unity of these states, but their determination to act firmly and without delay in the name of justice and law.

The Security Council decision was made in a difficult and responsible period in the course of international affairs. Just as the 'cold war' was becoming a thing of the past, the dark cloud of aggression against sovereign Kuwait covered the horizon, putting in danger the good prospects opening before the world. Today we can say with satisfaction that in these trying times the United Nations has passed the test. The clear evaluation of

Iraq's actions is proof that the United Nations can deal with a dangerous international crisis.

It should be noted that during the vote on the air blockade of Iraq, representatives of the several UN member states stressed: There should be no way back, the aggression should be stopped. Obviously the use of political pressure together with measures of an economic character should be used before anything else. The Soviet Union has supported precisely this position and still continues to support it. However, being realistic, the USSR will support activization of the UN Security Council's Military Staff Committee, and stresses its readiness to conclude the appropriate agreement with the Security Council—obviously together with other countries—so that structures and forces aimed at fighting the aggression will be created within the UN framework.

The prospect of creating such structures and forces appears important not only because the danger of aggression and of breaking the UN Charter, as the facts show, is far from being removed; it is important also because such actions cause unequivocal reaction and can not be acceptable by everyone, however justified unilateral military and political actions of separate countries might be. But no one will have reason to argue against actions by legal international 'law-enforcement organs'—the Security Council and its military staff committee.

Speaking at the 45th UN General Assembly session, Eduard Shevardnadze again appealed to the Iraqi leadership to "come to their senses and comply with the demands—not only legal, but commonsense ones." Will this appeal have any effect? Not all the bridges are burned, and the world has a right to hope that the crisis will be overcome before the weapons start talking.

Gulf Crisis Seen To Open New Prospects for Ties

PM2609171590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Sep 90 First Edition p 4

[Interview with N.A. Simoniya, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, by A. Kanishev and Yu. Stroyev; place and date not given: "Will Iraq Become a Second Vietnam?"—first paragraph is an editorial introduction]

[Text] The UN General Assembly session is again voicing condemnation of Iraq for its seizure of Kuwait and fueling conflict in the Persian Gulf region. At least 25 countries have already sent military contingents to this zone, primarily to Saudi Arabia. The situation is worsening all the time. How real is the threat of military conflict? It was with that question that we began our conversation with Nodari Aleksandrovich Simoniya, well known political scientist and deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of the World Economy and International Relations.

[Simoniya] The reality is that Iraq's actions have presented the entire civilized world with a harsh choice. At the moment political and indirect military pressure is still being applied. But let us not forget the heat of passions and the vast quantity of arms already in or on their way to the Persian Gulf region. I think that the psychological situation is such that if the United States resorted to extreme unilateral measures—without any preparation and without any resolutions—its action would be vindicated, including in the Arab world. As we know, that world is far from united in its assessment of the Iraqi invasion. The potential consequences of military conflict are a different matter. Clearly, it is not just the fate of Kuwait, from which Baghdad will have to withdraw its troops, that will be affected but also how the situation shapes up in Iraq itself and throughout the region.

I do not envisage the Soviet Union's becoming directly involved in an armed conflict. At the same time, we have clearly expressed our attitude toward the aggression against Kuwait.

[PRAVDA] Nevertheless, even if many people do not accuse us openly, they do continue to raise one way or another the question of Soviet military advisers in Iraq....

[Simoniya] Even though there are still individual voices in the West talking about our military experts remaining in Iraq, I would remind you that their number is being rapidly reduced. We are emerging with dignity from the delicate situation that has been created. This may be regarded as the Soviet Union's practical departure from the stereotypes of the old thinking and from relations which were formed de facto in the framework of those stereotypes. In so doing we are laying the foundation of new future relations with the whole world.

[PRAVDA] Paradoxical as it may seem, the Persian Gulf crisis has actually opened up new prospects for international relations. Nevertheless, how justified are the actions of the international community in stepping up sanctions against Iraq, especially on the part of those who retain formal diplomatic relations with Iraq?

[Simoniya] I think that this is a rare occasion when everyone is guided by the principles of international law and common human and civilized considerations, not those of ideology or confrontation. This attests to the beginning of a new era in international relations. In this instance, the United States is behaving properly. Saudi Arabia officially invited the United States in, and it was supported by a number of Arab countries which have also sent troops. We also support the common approach to Iraq. Admittedly, there are certain individual disagreements with the United States—that is natural. But in principle, when it comes to the general strengthening of international law and the role of the United Nations, we have much in common.

[PRAVDA] In this instance, do the general principles of the United Nations not conflict with bilateral diplomatic relations?

[Simoniya] I do not think so. The United Nations has at last started to be the kind of international organization that it was meant to be and which it has failed to be because of ideological disagreements. The United Nations is a universal international organization pledged to work for peace in any region and at any point on the globe. In this case, too, the conduct of the countries which have bilateral relations with Iraq coincide in principle with the UN line.

[PRAVDA] Iraq is linking the seizure of Kuwait and the fueling of the atmosphere in the region with the Palestinian problem and problems of the Arab world in general in the light of the Israeli occupation. True, many regard this skeptically.

[Simoniya] The Palestinian version did not appear immediately but only when there was unanimous condemnation of the aggressive action. The aim here is simple—embroiling Israel would alter the character of the conflict and force the Arabs to unite around Baghdad. Husayn would become the standard bearer of the struggle to restore justice. However, Tel Aviv's restrained reaction in this instance gives no ground for such maneuvers.

[PRAVDA] Let us return to the possible development of events in the Persian Gulf. The majority expect a peaceful settlement....

[Simoniya] I can only say what I think is likely to happen. There are, of course, two options—a peaceful settlement and a nonpeaceful one. As of today the latter is unfortunately assuming real shape. Everyone is saying that it could go on a long time. And they are forgetting that the Near East is not Vietnam. In Vietnam you could fight 10 years or more—there are jungles and other factors. But here there is desert. Everything is out in the open. Predictions of a protracted war and a repetition of Vietnam are purely journalistic parallels.

However, I do not rule out the other scenario: A political solution and Iraq's fulfillment of the UN Security Council resolutions, if only it is guided by common sense and is not afraid of losing face.

Talks With PLO Leaders in Moscow Analyzed

LD2609171690 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 19 Sep 90

[Commentary by (Vladimir Kavalev): "The Crisis in the Gulf Region, the PLO, and the Palestine Issue"]

[Text] A series of talks, meetings and contacts were held recently in Moscow with senior representatives of Arab countries. The crisis in the Gulf region was their main subject. The regular session of the Soviet-Palestinian working commission is due to be held soon. The Iraqi invasion of Kuwait has turned the balance in the Middle East upside down. The efforts aimed at moving the peace process in the region, which was restricted due to Tel Aviv's unconstructive stand, have experienced a set back.

It is worth noting that the concern of the Soviet Union and the PLO over the deteriorating situation in the region, and their endeavor to exchange views on possible practical steps toward a comprehensive solution in the Middle East, is understood. Soviet-Palestinian political cooperation has passed the test of time. The basis of its solidity is the unity of the principled stances vis-a-vis resolving the region's issues on the basis of a balance of interests and respect for the rights of all the Middle Eastern peoples, including the right of the Palestinian people to self-determination and the establishment of their independent state.

Despite the fact that the international community's attention, for understandable reasons, is diverted from the issue of an Arab-Israeli settlement, the issue still remains pressing. Close examination of the subsequential measures to be adopted is necessary. It is not a coincidence that the joint statement adopted by Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush in Helsinki points out the need to work actively toward the resolution of all the remaining conflicts in the Middle East and the Gulf region. It may said that the beginning of a search for stances vis-a-vis the establishment of a comprehensive system for the region's security under the current circumstances is a matter of time. The Iraqi occupation of Kuwait cannot be tolerated from the point of view of the rules of international norms, nor can the Israeli occupation of Arab territories be tolerated. It is worth noting that betting on military power is meaningless when the arms race continues in the region.

The voice of the heroic defiance of the [word indistinct] force by the participants in the peaceful Palestinian intifadah, which has been continuing for over 1,000 days, is rising higher by the day. Blame is placed by some Arab and Western capitals on the PLO for its pro-Iraqi stance. This is not a simple matter, and there is no need to discuss the details. However, it may be said that if we want to find a political solution to the conflict in the Gulf region, it is important to maintain contacts with Baghdad. Evidence of the necessity of this step is seen in the practice of resolving all international crisis.

There is no doubt that the PLO is contributing its share in the search for a peaceful formula in the Gulf region. The way out of the current dilemma in the Middle East is limited to honorable collective efforts, including efforts made by Arabs themselves. The Arab world is still divided on many principal issues, which, with great regret, prevents the Arab League from assuming its required role in the Gulf region. It is natural that the majority of Arabs now understand the self-evident question, namely, that peace cannot be established in the region except around the negotiating table, and via mutual compromises and a middle solution. There is no doubt that a specific way out of this critical situation will

be found if the rules of international norms are adhered to in a truly generalized way.

However, time has come to move from words to deeds. This stance is supported by the Soviet Union, which expresses its readiness to cooperate with anyone concerned with unshakable peace in the Middle East.

Palestinian Embassy Responds to Media Criticism

LD2609213190 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1300 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] The editorial body of our radio has received a letter from the embassy of the state of Palestine in Moscow which included an embassy statement. We present to you its full text without comment, and we apologize if it does not fully conform to the text of the statement issued in Arabic, because we received it in Russian and it was then translated:

Many comments and reports have appeared in Soviet newspapers which criticize the PLO's stance vis-a-vis the recent events in the Gulf region. We respect the right of Soviet journalists to express their views, which is considered one of the features of freedom in the Soviet Union. However, we want our Soviet friends to give us the opportunity to explain the bases of the Palestinian stance by putting forward realistic reports about the matter.

First, the PLO is not and has not been a side in the Gulf conflict. It is an active mediator working toward finding a political solution to the crisis. Second, the PLO believes that the possibility of resolving the crisis within the Arab context has not been fully explored. This view enjoys the support of the majority of the countries in the world. Third, the PLO stresses the principle of not allowing the seizure of land belonging to others by force—thus respecting international legitimacy and its decisive role in resolving all international disputes.

On the basis of this it may be concluded that it is necessary to respect the principles of legitimacy everywhere in order to respect the UN resolutions on the Gulf—because the numerous UN resolutions on the settlement of the Palestine issue have not been implemented over a period of around half a century. We would like to recall that the United States is the only country which is openly objecting to the participation of the UN effectively in the resolution of international disputes.

Fourth, the PLO has repeatedly put forward peace initiatives on the Gulf in consultation with many Arab countries. The organization will continue its efforts in that direction, and will not retreat from that path despite the pressure put on it by various sides. Our objective is to extinguish the fuse of the explosion, and to find a political solution that would suit all sides. The organization's persistent and effective efforts is required now.

The Palestinian people, who are engaged in their just intifadah to end occupation, liberate their land, and gain their national independence, are endeavoring to peacefully resolve the conflict in the Arab Gulf. Meanwhile, effective joint efforts aimed at convening a Middle East peace conference to bring about a constructive solution of all the issues of the region must be stepped up.

Situation in United Arab Emirates Examined

PM2609142190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 90 p 3

[Article by special correspondent A. Shumilin: "The Emirates After the Shock"]

[Text] Abu Dhabi—If you want peace, prepare for war. So say the representatives of the military-industrial complexes of various countries both when they have work to do and when they do not. When they have work to do, that is, when there is a real external threat and the country's minimum defense sufficiency is already becoming insufficient. And when they do not, that is, when—in the absence of any real threat—they attempt to justify the huge expenditure on their existence, and the overblown military machine and its elite commanders impose on the state their own development logic for behavior both inside the country and outside. Judging by everything, the preparation and waging of wars constitute the militarized Iraqi state's raison d'etre. Force must be countered by force—that is why the countries of the Arabian peninsula which oppose Iraq are preparing for war even though it goes against the grain: These Arab states have different development priorities and a different logic of existence.

The UAE [United Arab Emirates] has announced a recruiting campaign for volunteers to join a special women's subunit—possibly for the first time in the Islamic countries' modern history. After all, Islam, more than any other religion, allots women a strictly defined role as keepers of the home fires and continuers of the family line. Three days after the announcement of the recruiting campaign for volunteers 600 representatives of the weaker sex aged 18-35 were successfully tested and joined the subunit. This women's subunit, together with 70,000 male volunteers, will soon occupy the country's front-line defense positions. Security is currently ensured by the regular UAE Army of 67,000 men. I was told at the UAE Ministry of Information that there are now 450 French servicemen in the country "on an individual basis."

However, leaving aside the military reports in newspapers and on local television, it can quite easily be said that life in Abu Dhabi and the other UAE emirates has returned to normal after the short-lived shock in August. The numerous bazaars and stores are open and bustling late into the night, and the impressive multistory big-name stores, which look as though they have been transported to the Persian Gulf from London or Paris, are ablaze with advertisements. This country's "profession" is peace. The prosperity of the UAE rests on oil and international trade.

What is life like for Soviet citizens under these conditions? There are something like 150 Soviet citizens in the UAE, mainly scattered around three different emirates. I was told by Soviet Minister-Counselor S. Vladimirov that the embassy has worked out plans for the possible evacuation of our compatriots, although the likelihood of this is not great. The situation in the country is not yet having any impact on the work of Soviet specialists—oil drilling technicians, medics, and sports coaches. The embassy has considerably reorganized its work: It works virtually around the clock. And, of course, as always, "aggression," which they were forced to tolerate during quiet times, is far more sharply felt at a time of crisis. It is hard to imagine, but the Soviet Embassy in the UAE has no operational communications with Moscow, despite the fact that this country's lines of communication are virtually the best in the world. Any capital, apart from Moscow, can be called direct instantly. Local communications services are prepared to make contact with Moscow and the whole world. I was told that it is Moscow which is not prepared for this!

East Europe

Bulgaria's Lukanov Continues Soviet Visit

Meets With Ryzhkov 25 Sep

LD2509145990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 25 Sep (TASS)—Talks were held today between N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of ministers, and A. Lukanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, who has arrived in Moscow on a working visit. Questions of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation and also certain topical international problems were discussed.

A. Lukanov, reporting on the internal situation in Bulgaria, stressed that the Bulgarian government intends to pursue a firm course aimed at bringing the country out of its period of socioeconomic difficulty as soon as possible, and at achieving a strengthening of democracy and legality and observance of human rights.

N.I. Ryzhkov spoke of the discussions taking place in the USSR about the fundamental issues of the existing draft programs for the stabilization of the situation and for establishing the foundations of a regulated and socially oriented economy, and of the preparation of a new Union treaty aimed at changing the face of the Soviet federation.

The heads of government noted that the transformations being implemented in both countries require the review and consistent renewal of the mechanism of bilateral economic and scientific and technical cooperation, which should reflect the conditions of market relations. Moreover, everything of a positive kind in the practice of traditional Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation should be preserved. In this connection, the importance was noted of the intergovernmental agreement on the transition from 1 January 1991 to a new mechanism for mutual economic ties using freely convertible currency and based on current world prices.

N.I. Ryzhkov and A. Lukanov discussed the progress of implementing the protocol on trade turnover between the USSR and Bulgaria in 1990 and possible measures to make up shortfalls in goods supplies.

It was acknowledged as necessary to provide comprehensive aid to develop Bulgaria's economic links with the Soviet republics at the regional level as well as at the level of associations and enterprises. This work should be combined with mutual efforts to preserve and deepen cooperative links, bilateral specialization, and scientific and technical and production cooperation.

As was noted by both sides, the development of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation on market relation principles will be an incentive to raise the quality of both countries' output and its competitiveness on the international markets, something that is an indispensible condition of the efficient foreign economic relations of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria with the rest of the world as well.

The talks demonstrated the high degree of mutual understanding between the USSR and the People's Republic of Bulgaria on the issues under discussion and the commitment to expanding bilateral Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation and interaction.

Discusses Trade Concerns

AU2509201390 Sofia BTA in English 1940 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, September 25 (BTA)—How much oil will Bulgaria get from the Soviet Union until the end of the year? Giving an indirect answer to this question, the Soviet prime minister, Mr. Nikolay Ryzhkov, today said that the problem would be considered and that the concern of the Bulgarian Government would be taken into account.

The leader of the Soviet Government was interviewed by Bulgarian journalists a little before the beginning of his talks with Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov of Bulgaria, who arrived in Moscow on a business visit last night.

Mr. Nikolay Ryzhkov made it clear, however, that the problem was related to Bulgaria's deliveries to the USSR. He pointed out that there were products of technical designation the USSR could not do without. He laid stress on Soviet requirements of foodstuffs and industrial consumer goods. He reminded the cigarette-shortage crisis of the last months, hinting that it had been aggravated not only through the failures of the local producers, but also by "our friends failing to effect deliveries"

A little bit earlier Mr. Andrey Lukanov specified that in the conditions of "commodity hunger in the Soviet market", Bulgaria was behind schedule with deliveries

amounting to half a million rubles. He underlined that Bulgaria would seek to "ensure the maximum possibility for raw material supplies from the USSR". In his opinion Europe cannot be an alternative in this respect; besides he said that "we cannot rely on marketing our products there".

The two government leaders were unanimous that the most important thing now was to find the mechanism of future interaction and the basis on which the two countries' relations should be placed. This is obviously associated with the transition of both economies to market relations, with the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Settlement of Payments in Convertible Currency as of January 1, 1990 at Current Prices Prevailing in the International Market. In this connection Mr. Nikolay Ryzhkov said that the transition could have some advantageous "peculiarities" for Bulgaria. He also underlined that "Bulgaria is a friendly country" and that both countries, despite any difficulties, should develop all their relations political, humanitarian, economic.

Mr. Andrey Lukanov underlined, that a going back to "the happy old care-free condition" in which both sides had lulled themselves to sleep was no longer possible. He underlined once more that "our relations with the USSR are of vital importance to us". He expressed his hope that "mutually advantageous agreements can be reached which would give Bulgaria a chance".

Received by Gorbachev 26 Sep

PM2709093190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[PRAVDA report entitled "Meeting in Kremlin"]

[Text] On 26 September M.S. Gorbachev received A. Lukanov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the People's Republic of Bulgaria [PRB]. He handed over to the USSR president a private message from Zh. Zhelev, the PRB president, which states that Bulgaria, which is engaged in profound democratic changes, will continue to attach extraordinary importance to the maintenance and development of relations with the Soviet Union. These relations are being looked upon in the message as a complete complex of economic, political, spiritual, scientific, and cultural ties which historically came about between two close and friendly countries.

M.S. Gorbachev shared the high positive assessments of Soviet-Bulgarian relations contained in the message, and confirmed the interest of the Soviet Union in strengthening and renewing Soviet-Bulgarian ties on the basis of equality, mutual benefit, and sober consideration of the real interests and potential of the sides and the major changes taking place in the world at the present time.

The USSR president and the head of the Bulgarian Government observed that, even in the present, changing situation, mutual loyalty to alliance commitments and to the traditions of friendship and spiritual communion between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Bulgaria remains topical and fruitful. Mutual interests was stressed in strengthening stability in Eastern Europe, in the Balkans, and in the Mediterranean, which is a substantial condition for the confident advance of the all-European process.

Touching on the subject, vital to both countries, of the accelerated transition to a socially orientated market economy, the interlocutors expressed their common conviction that the success of that transition was crucially dependent on broad, constructive civic concord, and on the overcoming of destructive tendencies that various extremist circles were trying to force on society.

M.S. Gorbachev gratefully acknowledged President Zh. Zhelev's invitation to visit Bulgaria, which was conveyed to him, and on his part, invited him to visit the Soviet Union. G. Pankov, Bulgarian ambassador to the USSR, and V.V. Sharapov, USSR ambassador to Bulgaria, took part in the talk.

Plans Economic Pact With Russia

LD2609220890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1424 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Excerpts] Moscow, 26 Sep (TASS)—Fundamental approaches to the development of cooperation between the Russian Federation and Bulgaria were discussed today at a meeting between Ivan Silayev, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Council of Ministers, and Andrey Lukanov, chairman of the Bulgarian Council of Ministers.

The Bulgarian premier noted that the RSFSR takes more than 80 percent of the overall volume of economic cooperation between Bulgaria and the USSR. [passage omitted]

The head of the RSFSR Government stated that a final variant of an economic agreement between the RSFSR and Bulgaria could be signed in November 1990. The Russian premier stressed that all previous treaties and commitments of the Union Government before Bulgaria, the implementation of which affects Russia's territory and interests, are being acknowledged and endorsed by the new government of the republic.

Sends Message to Gorbachev

AU2709084090 Sofia BTA in English 2122 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, September 26 (BTA correspondent)—Today Bulgaria's Prime Minister Andrey Lukanov was received by the president of the USSR, Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev, to whom he delivered a personal message from the Bulgarian president, Dr. Zhelyu Zhelev. In the message it is underlined that Bulgaria, in which sweeping democratic changes are being carried out, attaches paramount importance to the preservation and the promotion of her relations with the Soviet Union. These relations are seen as a whole complex of economic,

political, intellectual, scientific and cultural ties historically established between the two friendly countries.

Mr. Gorbachev confirmed the high evaluation of Soviet-Bulgarian relations contained in the message and the interest of the USSR to strengthen and renew them on the basis of equality and mutual advantage, by soberly taking into account the actual possibilities and interests of the two countries and the sweeping changes in the world.

The two sides shared the opinion that in today's changing situation the mutual faithfulness to the reciprocal obligations assumed by the allies and the traditions of friendship and spiritual communication between the peoples of the USSR and Bulgaria are still valid and fruitful. Stress was laid on the shared desire for strengthening the stability in Eastern Europe, the Balkans and the Mediterranean, which is considered to be an extremely important condition for the advancement of the all-European process.

The two sides also expressed their conviction that the success of the process which is of vital importance for both countries—the transition to a socially-oriented market economy—depends primarily on reaching a constructive civil consensus and on overcoming the destructive trends which certain extremist circles are trying to impose on society.

Mr. Mikhail Gorbachev accepted with gratitude the invitation extended to him on behalf of Dr. Zhelyu Zhelev to visit Bulgaria and invited him on a visit to the USSR in his turn.

Today the Bulgarian Government leader had a meeting with the prime minister of the Russian SFSR [Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], Mr. Ivan Silayev, which was almost two hours long. During the talks attention centred on the mechanism which should be worked out for the transition of bilateral relations to payments in convertible currency at current prices prevailing in the world market.

Mr. Andrey Lukanov pointed out that Russia accounts for four-fifths of Bulgaria's economic cooperation with the USSR and that the condition of Bulgaria's economy and her very existence depend on keeping this level of interaction. He spoke in favour of a transitional period before making a complete switch to the new type of relations, during which such forms of trade as clearing could be made use of.

The Bulgarian premier declared himself to be for the preservation and the strengthening of the relations between enterprises of the two countries which should be to their mutual advantage. He pointed out that Bulgaria is interested in keeping the volume of joint production, especially in the timber industry. Bulgaria is ready to deliver to the Russian SFSR foodstuffs, industrial and farming equipment and to cooperate with it in the development of tourism and the conversion of the military industry.

The Russian prime minister stated that the new government of the republic accepts and confirms all previous agreements and obligations of the USSR to Bulgaria, which have to do with Russia's territory and interests.

He told journalists here that an economic agreement between Bulgaria and the Russian SFSR could be signed in November this year.

Shevardnadze Greets Hungary on Anniversary

LD2509134390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0710 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, 25 Sep (TASS)—On the occasion of the 45th anniversary of the restoration of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Hungary, USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and Hungarian Foreign Minister G. Jeszenszky exchanged contratulatory telegrams.

The Soviet side expressed the hope that traditions that have developed and withstood the test of time in Soviet-Hungarian relations will successfully promote the subsequent confirmation in relations between the USSR and Hungary of principles of good-neighborliness, equality of rights and mutual benefit, the emergence of cooperation between them at a qualitatively new level, and the strengthening of European and universal security.

The telegram from Budapest stresses that the government of the Republic of Hungary will continue to strive for good-neighborly relations between the two countries to develop in accordance with the democratic hopes of Europe and on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

Hungarian President Comments on Relations

LD2609023590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1743 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Zhirnikhin]

[Text] Budapest, 25 Sep (TASS)—The significant changes occurring in Hungary today would be impossible without the enormous transformations being made in the Soviet Union, and by the USSR's new foreign policy course elaborated by M.S. Gorbachev, Arpad Goncz, president of the Hungarian Republic, stated at a meeting held today with Soviet journalist accredited in Hungary. Although the changes going on now in the two countries cannot be compared, in terms of either their scope or the scale of their influence on the course of world events, I can say with certainty: the processes taking place in the USSR and Hungary are developing in parallel.

It is perfectly obvious, the head of the Hungarian state stressed, that the conclusion that Hungary and the USSR are "natural allies" flows naturally from the parallel historical path. It is necessary for our countries to help each other in the field of transformations, and to have an understanding attitude to the difficulties which both the

USSR and Hungary undoubtedly face. The general disposition of the Hungarian people eloquently demonstrates that anti-Sovietism is alien to them. As far as I know, the president went on, the withdrawal of Soviet troops is not being accompanied by any undesirable excesses on the part of the Hungarian people. We are glad for the young men from various corners of the Soviet Union who are returning to their homeland now.

Not only the maintenance of correct bilateral relations with the Soviet Union, but also, if possible, the formation of such a system of goodneighbourly relations as would fully meet the interests of both countries, is an important national interest of Hungary. The two neighboring countries must live in conditions of friendship and mutual understanding. At the present stage, one should not only develop economic cooperation but also promote the expansion of the exchange of cultural values between the two countries, and assist in every way the establishment of immediate contacts between people.

At the present time, economic ties between Hungary and the Soviet Union are fairly close, the president stressed. To a certain extent, the economies of the two countries supplement each other. Deliveries of Soviet oil and raw materials for the chemical and the metallurgical industry are of decisive importance for the Hungarian republic. The Republic's enterprises, which are engaged in various sectors of the economy, are seeking to not allow a break and reduction of relations with Soviet partners. I am well aware of the state of affairs in workers' collectives, and therefore I am fully justified in speaking of an initiative from below, directed at developing cooperation with enterprises of the Soviet Union, A. Goncz noted. In turn, one should not lose the good reputation which Hungarian products have earned on the Soviet market.

Hungary is interested in the soonest possible strengthening and stabilization of the Soviet market, and also in speeding up privatization in the Hungarian economy. These two processes will to a considerable extent assist the strengthening of economic ties between the USSR and the Hungarian republic.

At the present stage of the formation of the mutual relations, it is necessary to take into account a certain erosion of the framework of the Union system, bearing in mind the fact that the organization of the Warsaw Treaty and CEMA are in a state of disintegration. The democratic society is being built in Hungary, the society which is developing in the direction of integration European structures and European community. The difference in the pace of chances which are happening now in the USSR and Hungary has led to the certain political alienation of the two countries. But, despite the change of political orientation of the country, Hungary is trying to improve economic tiers with the USSR, as it usually did,

Talking about his forthcoming visit to the Ukraine, A. Goncz stressed that there are between 150,000 and 200,000 Hungarians who live in Transcarpathia at the present time. The Republic of Hungary is trying to set up their cultural autonomy which does not have anything in common with territorial autonomy. And, that's why negotiations which are to take place in Kiev will be, to a large extent, dedicated to the Hungarian national minority situation.

Romanian Minister Attends Moscow Economic Talks

AU2609133490 Bucharest ROMPRES in English 1112 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Bucharest, ROMPRES, 26/9/1990—The Romanian-Soviet Joint Governmental Commission for Economic, Technical and Scientific Cooperation started its work in Moscow this morning, ROMPRES correspondents announced. The Romanian delegation led by Anton Vatasescu, minister of state for industrial and commercial activities, chairman for Romania, arrived in Moscow last night. The Soviet delegation to the talks is headed by P.I. Mostovoi, vice chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the commission for the Soviet Union.

The first plenary meeting concentrates on the state of bilateral relations and their development prospects against the background of structural changes in the economies of the two countries.

West Europe

Frolov Visits Italy for Newspaper Festival

Attends International Forum

PM2609160790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by special correspondents S. Kolesnikov, N. Miroshnik, and S. Oposhnyanskiy: "Concerts and Sharp Discussions"]

[Text] Modena, 21 Sep—The traditional national festival of the Italian Communists' newspaper L'UNITA is continuing here. Its program is varied. And it is difficult to say what is attracting a bigger audience—the concerts by popular artists who appear on the numerous stages one after the other, the sports competitions, or the sharp discussions in which leading Italian politicians and guests from various countries are participating.

The international forum on "Ideas of Freedom and Social Progress After the Revolutionary Transformations of 1989 in Europe" has just finished in the main hall in the festival center. I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and PRAVDA chief editor, who came here at the head of the CPSU Central Committee central press organ's delegation, participated in the discussion.

During the discussion various viewpoints were expressed on the processes recently taking place in East Europe. Representatives of communist parties and other political

organizations and social movements from Italy, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia gave sometimes contradictory, sometimes positive, and sometimes pessimistic assessments of the future development of socialist ideas on our continent, analyzed the events of the recent past, and predicted the future. Many tried to find the answer to the key question: Are the events that took place in East Europe a reflection of the socialist idea? Here is the viewpoint of P. Weiss, chairman of the Slovak Communist Party Central Committee Executive Committee: "A particular model of the organization of society—only proclaimed to be a society of real socialism—has been destroyed. Somewhere around here, we must look for the psychological explanation for the antisocialist and anticommunist sentiments in Czechoslovak society."

There are no historical parallels to the processes of the transition from an administrative-edict model of socialism to genuine democracy and from a state economy to a market economy. In this situation it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the dividing line between "rightists" and "leftists," the Bulgarian political scientist Ya. Stoilov believes. G. Spadolini, chairman of the Italian Senate, and G. Napolitano, member of the Italian Communist Party leadership, expressed their opinions on these problems.

Many theoretical and political concepts are now mixed up. A "geometrical approach" is inapplicable here. That is why scientists and politicians must carefully analyze reality, and not bewitch themselves with words, I.T. Frolov noted. It is impossible to understand anything about the events that are unfolding in East Europe today without looking at what has happened in the Soviet Union during perestroyka. And this is primarily a confirmation of the concept and practice of the new political thinking.

The Soviet Union supports the peoples who have made their choice and expressed their desire to live in a new way. We ourselves are also choosing our path. During the first "romantic" years of perestroyka, we said a resolute "no" to the authoritarian-bureaucratic system. Of course, perestroyka is now experiencing many difficulties—economic, social, and political difficulties. Some people are already starting to say that we should return to the pre-1985 situation. But this is scarcely what the whole world needs, since our foreign policy is wholly based on the ideals and values that perestroyka elaborated. At the same time we must value our country's leadership, which today is often reproached with indecisiveness and sluggishness. We must see the desire of the progressive section of the party, headed by M.S. Gorbachev, to move only in a peaceful way and avoid any kind of explosive situation.

We can move forward today only on the basis of stabilization and civil accord, the PRAVDA chief editor said. This will give socialism the possibility of getting a second wind and taking a step along the path toward a humane and democratic society.

The L'UNITA festival is continuing. There are more discussions and meetings ahead.

Attends Media Roundtable

PM2609100190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report by S. Kolesnikov and N. Miroshnik: "Building a European Home"]

[Text] Parma, 22 Sep—The common European home is being built not only on the foundations of economic and political cooperation. It cannot be erected without close collaboration among the mass media.

This was the subject under discussion in Parma, where representatives of leading newspapers on our continent and well known politicians from various countries met for a "roundtable." "The role of the mass media in a Greater Europe" was the subject proposed to the participants in the "roundtable" by its organizers—the EC Commission and the International Federation of Newspaper Publishers.

If the plans for creating a single Europe are to be successful, this will be thanks to support from people who have access to broad sources of information. The mass media should help people to see further and overcome prejudices and routine, the participants in the discussion noted.

I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, who was in Italy as a guest at the national festival of the newspaper L'UNITA, participated in the "roundtable" discussion. He spoke about the activity of the Soviet mass media in conditions of perestroyka and glasnost and about their role in the development of the role of democratization and the affirmation of the principles of the new political thinking.

Meets With Communist Party Head

PM2609121590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by own special correspondents S. Kolesnikov and N. Miroshnik: "L'UNITA Festival Over: Direct Discussion with Working People"]

[Excerpts] Modena, 23 Sep—The traditional national festival of the Italian communists' newspaper, L'UNITA, has ended here with a mass rally. [passage omitted]

A meeting took place at the end of the rally between I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chief editor of PRAVDA, with A. Occhetto, secretary general of the Italian Communist Party. I.T. Frolov conveyed greetings to Italian communists from M.S. Gorbachev and wishes for success in their struggle for democracy, social progress, and working people's interests. A meeting took place on the same day with R. Foa, chief editor of L'UNITA.

Luxembourg Parliamentarians Arrive in Moscow

Meet With Nishanov 26 Sep

LD2609162790 Moscow TASS in English 1507 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—A visiting delegation from the Luxembourg Parliament met Soviet legislators here today to discuss ways to consolidate relations between the two countries.

It was pointed out during their meeting with Council of Nationalities Chairman Rafik Nishanov that there still are substantial latent reserves for stepping up cooperation in such fields as politics, the economy and culture, as well as contacts between the Soviet and Luxembourg parliaments.

The visitors were also received at the Supreme Soviet Committee on International Relations. The leader of the Luxembourg delegation, Erna Hennicot-Schoepges, president of the Chamber of Deputies, said that Luxembourg Prime Minister Jacques Santer is going to visit the Soviet Union and that a cultural cooperation agreement is expected to be signed then. Speaking of various aspects of cultural cooperation, she singled out education as particularly promising.

Hennicot-Schoepges said that her country has good experience in banking and other financial activities and could help train Soviet experts in these fields now that the Soviet Union is switching over to a market system.

She also called the attention of Soviet colleagues to the Executive Committee of the Moscow City Council's new rules whereby Soviet enterprises and organisations inviting foreign specialists have to pay for their stay here in freely convertible currency. This practice, in her opinion, seriously impedes international contacts.

The Luxembourg parliamentarians later met members of the Supreme Soviet Committee on the Affairs of Women, the Family, Motherhood and Childhood.

Discuss Consolidating Ties

LD2609114290 Moscow TASS in English 1128 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Konstantin Voitsekhovich]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—A delegation from the Luxembourg parliament met Soviet legislators here today to discuss Soviet reforms and ways to consolidate relations between the two countries.

Vladimir Maslin, a member of the Supreme Soviet Committee on International Relations, said Soviet parliamentary deputies appreciate the achieved level of bilateral relations, but there still is much room for growth in cooperation in such fields as politics, the economy and culture, as well as contacts between the Soviet and Luxembourg parliaments.

The leader of the Luxembourg delegation, Erna Hennicot-Schoepges, president of the Chamber of Deputies, said that Luxembourg Prime Minister Jacques Santar is going to visit the Soviet Union and that a cultural cooperation agreement is expected to be signed then.

She said that her country has good experience in banking and other financial activities and could help train Soviet experts in these fields now that the Soviet Union is switching over to a market system.

Responding to her remarks about new Moscow rules, whereby Soviet enterprises and organisations inviting foreign specialists have to pay for their stay here in freely convertible currency, which impedes international contacts, Maslin expressed the opinion that this measure "will only be temporary".

Describing it as "not the best way to earn hard currency' he said that the parliament is taking steps to rectify the situation.

Maslin and his colleagues also briefed the visitors on various aspects of the planned transition to a market in the Soviet Union.

Yanayev Views Greek Head's Congressional Address

PM2609150990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Sep 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article from PRAVDA correspondent V. Potapov and TASS correspondents V. Malyshev and I. Sysoyev: "Getting Rid of the Burden of Mistakes"]

[Text] Athens, 21 Sep—The proceedings of the Second Congress of the Pan-Hellenic Socialist Movement [PASOK] began here yesterday in the Olympic complex hall. It is taking place under the slogans of the party's renewal and organizational perestroyka, of ridding the party of the burden of past mistakes, and of giving PASOK a more modern look. Participants in the forum will discuss proposals on the party's declaration, its new political platform, and new statutes. Among the guests of the congress of Greek Socialists are representatives of a wide spectrum of the country's political forces and envoys of over 40 parties and movements from 30 states, including a CPSU delegation headed by G.I. Yanayev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

PASOK is Greece's largest opposition party. It was in power for eight years (1981-1989). And its leader Andreas Papandreou was prime minister.

Delivering the political report at the congress, A. Papandreou sharply criticized the policy of the current ruling "New Democracy" conservative party, stating that it is leading the country into an "economic dead end" and toward a "national crisis," and he demanded the government's immediate resignation.

In A. Papandreou's words, PASOK favors the kind of development of society that is based on the "highest

socialist principles," but also discards everything negative that has occurred in the history of socialism's development. Greek Socialists, he said, must strive to build a "state of glasnost" where democratic principles and institutions will be developed, decentralization of power, protection of socialist property, and freedom to dissent will be ensured, and man will be put at the center of society.

The CPSU delegation head spoke at an evening sitting. He conveyed greetings from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to the congress participants.

G.I. Yanayev expressed his confidence that ties between the CPSU and PASOK will continue to develop successfully in the interests of strengthening peace and to the benefit of the Soviet and Greek peoples.

The PASOK Congress will last until 23 September.

Sitaryan, Finnish Premier View Economic Ties

LD2709004690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1650 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Voytto Leskinen]

[Text] Helsinki, 26 Sep (TASS)—The state of trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and Finland and ways to further develop them are under discussion at the meeting that opened here today of the cochairmen of the bilateral standing intergovernmental commission on economic cooperation. The delegations to the negotiations are led by S.A. Sitaryan, chairman of the Soviet section of the commission and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, the H. Holkeri, chairman of the Finnish section of the commission and Finnish prime minister.

The main attention in the negotiations that have begun will be paid to a consideration of new directions and forms in Soviet-Finnish cooperation. Answering journalists' questions before the start of his meeting with H. Holkeri, S.A. Sitaryan stressed that the Soviet delegation "will do the maximum possible to see that economic relations between our countries remain on a good and firm basis."

One of the questions put to the head of the Soviet delegation concerned the transfer of Soviet-Finnish trade to freely convertible currency. In this connection S.A. Sitaryan stated that during his talks with H. Holkeri "the form of payment will be chosen that will most facilitate the development and deepening of economic relations between the Soviet Union and Finland."

Military Inspectors Arrive in UK 26 Sep

LD2609123190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1204 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow 26 Sep (TASS)—It is officially reported here today that, in accordance with the provisions of the Stockholm conference document on measures for strengthening confidence, security, and disarmament in Europe, on 24 September 1990, the USSR government made a request to the government of Great Britain to carry out an inspection of military activity being carried out on its territory.

After receiving a positive reply to the request, a group of Soviet military inspectors arrived in Great Britain on 26 September and began the inspection.

Latin America & Caribbean

Brazilian Aeronautics Minister Arrives

PY2709004090 Moscow in Portuguese to Brazil 2200 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] At the invitation of Colonel General Shaposhnikov, Soviet Air Force commander in chief, Brazilian Aeronautics Minister Socrates da Costa Monteiro and his wife arrived in Moscow today for an official visit.

Following is a report by our correspondent (Aleksey Balandin):

I think a cordial reception marked the Brazilian minister's arrival at (?Sheremetyevo) airport on a rainy day in Moscow. (?He was welcomed) by the Soviet Air Force commander in chief, Air Force Joint Staff members, and Sebastiao Domingo Barbosa, Brazilian ambassador to the Soviet Union. The official guest and his Soviet host (?quickly engaged) in a friendly conversation. Mr. Socrates da Costa Monteiro was informed of the agenda for his stay in the Soviet Union. [Words indistinct] meetings with the Soviet defense minister, the civil aviation minister, and Aviation Industry Ministry and Atomic Industry Ministry officials; visits to aircraft plants; and talks with members of the Soviet Air Force.

Listen now to the interview granted by Mr. Socrates da Costa Monteiro at the airport:

[Begin recording] [(Balandin)] Sir, will you please make a statement for Radio Moscow?

[Monteiro] I want to go on record as expressing my satisfaction with the opportunity to be in the Soviet Union, and my thanks for the courtesy of the Soviet Air Force commander in chief's invitation. It is my pleasure to be here in response to that invitation, representing both the Brazilian Air Force and the Aeronautics Ministry, a separate organization that oversees activities such as civil aviation, aeronautics construction, and space research and development. For this reason, this visit is important for Brazil and I want to extend my compliments on behalf of the Brazilian people to the Soviet people who welcome me here.

[(Balandin)] Is this your first visit to the Soviet Union?

[Monteiro] Well, this is my second visit to the Soviet Union. I was here for the first time two years ago on an invitation as a member of the Brazilian Air Force Joint Staff. At that time we made very important contacts in

the technical, space, and military areas. I imagine that this time it will also be possible to strengthen bonds and cooperation between the Brazilian and Soviet Air Forces. [end recording]

Foreign Ministry Views Central American Security

LD2509140290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1330 GMT 24 Sep 90

[TASS diplomatic correspondent report from the USSR Foreign Ministry]

[Text] Moscow 24 Sep (TASS)—A USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman today described the outcome of the latest meeting of the commission for security in Central America as "a manifestation of sincere commitment on the part of the leaders of the Central American states to hasten the search for a peaceful solution to the problems that exist, and to establish an atmosphere of mutual trust and cooperation in their relations." In a statement to your TASS diplomatic correspondent he also voiced firm support for the decision made at the meeting.

Deputy ministers of foreign affairs and defense of five of the region's states took part in the meeting, held in the past few days in the El Salvadoran capital. Voicing concern over the continuing tension in the region, the participants in the meeting considered it necessary to ask the United Nations to examine the possibility of extending the mandate of the international organization's group of observers to ensure monitoring of the fulfillment of the agreements regarding the nonuse of territory for hostile activities against neighboring countries, and also to prevent arms smuggling.

Following on from the accords reached at the previous meeting, a decision was taken to set up a special subcommission, whose functions would include drawing up a plan of action to make an inventory of military facilities and to register the personnel and armaments in the countries of the region. When this work is completed, the idea is to hold full-scale negotiations on issues connected with reducing the Armed Forces and weapons in Central America.

The participants in the meeting backed the talks between the governments and the leaders of rebel organizations in El Salvador and Guatemala. "We have, on a number of occasions, articulated our positive attitude toward the efforts being undertaken by the Central American states to normalize the situation once and for all, and jointly to draw up steps to minimize the risk of a fresh and dangerous upsurg in armed confrontation in this still uneasy region of the world," the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

At the same time, commenting on the progress in the talks between the opposing sides in El Salvador, the USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman said:

"Against this background, reports that the latest round of talks between government spokesmen and the leaders of the FMLN in El Salvador ended last week with virtually no progress made, cannot but arouse concern. One gets the impression that the reason for this lies both deep down at the root of the conflict and in the persistent tendency of both sides to gamble on the possibility of resolving the conflict by means of arms. We continue to believe that a genuine settlement in El Salvador can only be achieved by due regard being taken for the interests of both sides, and by both sides making reasonable compromises and concessions. Putting forward ultimatums not only does not bring a solution to the conflict closer: quite the reverse, it strengthens the hands of the extremist groupings in the opposing camp, and time and again postpones indefinitely the prospect of peace being established in the country.

One could like to hope that the time that remains before the next meeting between the government and the rebels—due to take place not later than 4 November this year—will be employed by the sides not to build up their forces, but to draw up constructive new proposals which will enable specific peace accords to be reached."

Supreme Soviet

Deputies To Debate 'Freedom of Conscience' Bill

LD2609045190 Moscow TASS in English 0438 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov, Boris Zverev, Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The Soviet parliament will hold a joint session here today to debate a bill on the freedom of conscience and religious organisations.

On Tuesday, legislators discussed information on consultations with representatives of union and autonomous republics and non-governmental organisations on drafting a new Union treaty.

The Soviet legislature approved a proposal by President Mikhail Gorbachev to set up a preparatory committee to draft the treaty.

A decision adopted by lawmakers on the results of the debate assesses the future treaty as a "basis for the radical renewal of the Soviet Union".

USSR Supreme Soviet 26 Sep Session Detailed

LD2609190790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1745 GMT on 26 September begins to carry a recorded account of the USSR Supreme Soviet 26 September session in the Moscow Kremlin. A continuity announcer provides summary remarks about the session throughout the program. The announcer says that the session discussed the draft law on freedom of conscience. Lukyanov announces the speakers on the subject, including Russian Patriarch Aleksiy, a Seventh Day Adventist, and a rabbi.

At 1747 GMT Deputy Sebentsov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Legislation, comes to the podium and talks of the committee's work on this draft law. He discusses the contents of the articles. The church and state remain separate. He talks of the role of atheism and says that atheist organizations are different from religious ones. Atheist organizations should not be funded by the state, he says, adding that separation of school and church was discussed by the committee, including the hiring of teachers of religion and their pay. He says it was determined that the teachers should be paid for by religious organizations and that students in seminaries should be given the same rights as all other students.

At 1751 GMT the announcer says the question of registering religious organizations was raised, since registration ceased to exist. Organizations form themselves and abide by their own rules; a religious organization can be a juridical person it was noted. There were many demands that property be returned to the churches, says the announcer.

At 1754 GMT the announcer says the rights of military personnel to attend religious services has been guaranteed, as it has for people in hospitals and prisons. He notes that discrimination in work against people with religious convictions was outlawed. It was noted that the development of religious organizations and their increasing contacts with the state demands a state body to deal with religious matters—should this body be part of the Council of Ministers or independent of it? The announcer says it was decided that deputies should not make up the organ, as deputies change and the body should be stable, although this does not mean that the deputies cannot have their committee on religious matters. The present draft law envisages that the body should be under the control of the Council of Ministers, the anouncer says.

At 1759 GMT the announcer says that questions to Sebentsov followed.

At 1800 GMT Patriarch Aleksiy comes to the podium to speak on freedom of conscience. This freedom exists and is not dependent on society or laws, he says. Every man has the freedom to act according to his conscience—how much he is able to act thus often depends on the state and society in which he lives. Aleksiy says the church wants to serve the people and fulfill its moral duty. The question of teaching religion in schools has been raised and society is in favor of it, he says. The sacrifices made by old women in church and their activities have sustained the church, but it is the young who are capable of revitalizing the church, and it is to the young that the clergy must preach, says Aleksiy.

At 1804 GMT Aleksiy says it is important that the draft law recognizes religious communities and churches as part of society. In the past the church has experienced divisive events—therefore the use of the word unification is important.

At 1807 GMT the writer Belov speaks. He mentions Solzhenytsyn and the attacks he has suffered in the media. He says that the state has exploited Russia as a "semi-colony" and it is now exhausted of all its resources.

At 1811 GMT Lukyanov asks why the speaker is not speaking on the theme under discussion.

At 1812 GMT Belov continues and says that every man should be ruled by moral law. He proposes that the draft law be adopted with the amendments proposed by the patriarch. He also proposes that the churches in the Kremlin be returned to the church.

At 1813 GMT a representative of the Seventh Day Adventists, (Kolchin), comes to the podium to speak on the draft law. He says that it really does give the citizens

the full right to live according to their religious convictions. He talks of his church's seminary which not only trains future pastors but also trains specialists in agriculture.

At 1816 GMT Deputy Ergashev says that this law should be called a basis for a law on freedom of religions, thus allowing republics to draw up their own laws taking into account local conditions.

At 1817 GMT Deputy Pashaly speaks, saying that the people are not just a sum of population, but something greater. His constituents—various nationalities, but all orthodox—are against the Mordovan church uniting with the Romanian church, and he asks the patriarch not to interfere with their wishes. The Russians, Bulgarians, and Gagauz in his constituency do not want to unite with Romania.

At 1821 GMT Lukyanov talks of an article in today's KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA concerning troop movements around Moscow, to which Yazov wishes to reply to set things straight.

At 1822 GMT Yazov comes to the podium and refutes the allegations of the article.

At 1830 GMT the announcer says that a question and answer session followed.

At 1831 GMT Lukyanov says that they should return to the original discussion on freedom of conscience. Deputies from the floor then raise various procedural matters and try to talk on other matters, quoting from today's newspapers. One deputy talks of the need for a committee to investigate the article in question.

At 1835 GMT the announcer says that discussion of the draft law then continued.

At 1835 GMT Deputy Kucherenko talks on the taxation side of the law as regards the church. He proposes and amendment which is rejected.

At 1837 GMT the announcer says that further discussion was postponed until 1 October. An appeal by deputies from Kazakhstan on giving earthquake victims help was adopted. He says that on this point the session ended.

Freedom of Conscience Bill Approved 'in Principle'

Church Leaders' Remarks Noted

LD2609133990 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The Soviet parliament discussed today a bill on freedom of conscience and religious organisations, which was published in the press a short time ago, triggering public discussion.

Taking the floor on behalf of parliament's Legal Committee, Andrey Sebentsov noted that the submitted bill incorporated proposals made during the public discussion.

Then the floor was taken by people's deputy, Russian Orthodox church head Aleksiy the second, who handed over to the Supreme Soviet chairman a list of proposals from his church. He said that the extent of freedom of conscience in a society depended on whether state and public institutions protected people living according to their conscience or sought to stamp out man's independent conscience by force.

"We are not demanding a slice of our society's pie, we do not ask for rights, we only wish to serve our people by every means at our disposal and the best we can," he said.

The Church demands the lifting of restrictions, which the patriarch believes still exist, on all such efforts and the elimination of obstacles put up "between our desire to aid people and the people themselves."

"We want to fulfil our moral commitments. This is the duty of our conscience and our faith," the patriarch said. He reiterated an earlier Church proposal to teach religious disciplines in secular educational establishments.

As distinct from the law in force, the current bill makes allowances for religious education. Students of ecclesiastical schools will finally be granted rights now enjoyed by all Soviet students. Moreover, servicemen will be given the right to engage in religious activities in their free time. There will be no discrimination of people employed by religious organisations or of clergymen.

The speakers stressed the importance of having a state body responsible for religious affairs. It is envisaged to set it up on a federal basis. The republics will be given the right "to decide this question themselves as they see it fit".

Head of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church Mikhail Kulakov, who attended the meeting, spoke highly of the submitted bill. "I rejoice at the good will and effort with which the document was drawn up in order to give every citizen the right to satisfy his spiritual requirements," he said. Kulakov called for the right of the Church to set up its own general-purpose schools.

Parliament then approved the bill in principle and went over to its article-by-article endorsement.

'Serious Differences' Expressed

LD2609185790 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow 26 September TASS—At the afternoon joint session of the Soviet parliamentary chambers,

deputies continued to disscuss the second reading of the law of the USSR "On the Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations."

The bill establishes the main guarantees of the freedom of conscience in the country. A general legislation on the freedom of conscience and religious organizations will include, apart from this law, appropriate acts by union and autonomous republics.

The bill is to guarantee people's rights to determine and express their attitude towards religion and to [word indistinct] profess religion and perform appropriate rites. It also provides for "social justice and equality, the defence of the rights and interests of citizens irrespective of attitude to religion."

The bill upholds the separation of the church from the state, as has been accepted in all civilized countries, and equal rights of all religions and creeds before Soviet laws, which is particularly important in the country with dozens of religious denominations.

The bill in the activities of political parties renders financial support to them.

This legislative act precludes the possibility of the financing of atheistic organizations and atheism popularization activities by the state.

Reaffirming that "the state education system in the Soviet Union is separated from the church and is of secular nature" the bill, unlike the previous law, envisages the possibilities of religious education of children and adults.

It was supposed that the members of parliament would adopt the bill today at the morning session. However, serious differences arose between deputies over two points: the advisability of a legislative permission to use the premises of state-run educational establishments for religious instruction at extra-curricular time, and the taxation of financial and property donations to religious organizations.

Besides, there turned out to be the lack of quorum for voting during the afternoon session. Parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov had to interrupt the discussion of the bill and it was postponed until a regular joint session to be held on Monday.

In the coming two days the members of parliament will continue to work in committees and commissions.

Yazov Explains Troop Movements to Supreme Soviet

LD2609203190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1745 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Remarks by USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov at the 26 September session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Moscow Kremlin; Yazov's remarks are preceded by a question presented to Yazov by session Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov, on the part of four USSR People's Deputies—recorded]

[Text] [Lukyanov] We earnestly request that an explanation be given immediately in connection with the information given by Colonel Kudinov, head of the political department of the Ryazan Airborne Assault Higher Command College, which was published in today's issue of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in an article entitled: "And Someone Thought Exercises Were Underway"—especially in view of the fact that you gave different information at the beginning of the session. Where is the truth? This question is of concern. [Signed] Deputies (?Dokayev), Yemelyanov, Yezhelev, and Yefimov.

[Yazov] On the article in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA: It asserts that a sitting of the bureau took place on 6 September—allegedly—which examined the question of certain information from the Committee for State Security. A Congress of the Russian Federation took place on the 6th of the month, and all the comrades from Ryazan, including members of the bureau of the oblast committee, were present at the congress. As has been stated by Comrade Khitrun, the first secretary, there was no bureau session or conference on this question.

On the 10th of the month the chairman of the KGB was telephoned by Comrade Ryumin, chairman of the city soviet, who introduced himself as a member of the Democratic Russia movement, and who said that troops were moving toward Moscow and asked: Why are you not reporting this to us? On the 16th, Ryumin addressed a meeting in Ryazan and again raised this question. In actual fact, a regiment of the Tula assault division, which is stationed in Ryazan, did indeed arrive in Moscow from the 9th to the 10th of the month in order to take part in a parade.

A long time before that date—in fact on 30 July—an order was signed by the acting commander of the Moscow military district that this regiment had to be in Moscow on the 10th. And it did arrive in accordance with this order. Why did this regiment travel with its equipment? Because this regiment is going to take part in the parade with its equipment. At the same time, a second assault regiment arrived from Kostroma in motor vehicles. It will take part on foot.

The next thesis from this article is about the fact that while the regiment was moving it crushed several motor vehicles, and so on. There was a road accident. A warrant officer in his Zaporozhets car collided with a GAZ-69 in which an investigator from the procuracy was traveling, but that was on the 11th, 24 hours after the regiment had left.

The next question concerns the regiment going out with ammunition. Yes, airborne troops—no matter where they go—always go fully equipped in this country.

Ammunition was unloaded to another unit here, and there, where the regiment is, there of course is no ammunition.

Of the division that is stationed in Vitebsk—the article claims that it moved toward Moscow—not one company, not one subunit of this division was put on a state of alert, and not a single step was made in the direction of Moscow. I made a special point to talk today with the chief of the divisional headquarters and the division commander, and they did not receive any orders regarding this matter and they did not carry out any movements.

It is claimed that the Dzerzhinskiy Division was placed in a state of full combat readiness. I spoke to the division commander. From this division 2,050 men are in Nagorno-Karabakh, 350 are helping store vegetables in Kazakhstan, 1,300 men are digging up potatoes in Moscow oblast, and 1,000 men are carrying out patrol duties in Moscow—and during this time the division was never placed on combat readiness.

Thus, all the facts set out in the article are fabricated. An exercise did in fact take place. I have here a map of the exercise. I can show anyone who wants to see it. It was approved on 25 August by the chief of the General Staff. Colonel-General (Kachalov), commander of airborne assault troops, was in charge of the exericse.

The same question was asked at a meeting between Comrade Silayev and commanders of troops of military districts, which I also attended. People also asked why buses carrying people, vehicles, and so on were traveling around Moscow.

I have to report to the esteemed deputies that 23,000 people from Moscow Military District alone are now taking part in the potato harvest. They have to travel in something!

As regards all sorts of recordings, evidently it is necessary to appoint a special investigation—and I think that an examination by the Procurator's Office is best—to conduct an examination of all these facts, and listen to what kind of recordings these are, who said what where. At the moment it is difficult to say, especially as Comrade Kudinov, Sergey Mikhailovich, member of the Democratic Russia Party, has completely failed to carry out the educational work which was needed in the Ryazan academy, and he has been released from his duties as chief of the political department.

As for Valeriy Vasilyevich Ryumin, he is a former teacher at the Department of Marxism-Leninism, who, according to what he says, broke completely with Marxism-Leninism, so how could he have been retained in the post any longer? He was elected chairman of the town soviet in the town of Ryazan.

I can report again quite officially that neither the airborne assault troops, nor any other troops were given any tasks. And the fact that some kind of rally was to take place on the 16th... [pauses] behind Comrade Belozertsev's question was the implication that the assault troops were being prepared to break up the rally. At any rate, I did not personally know anything about the rally. No one was preparing the assault troops for this purpose.

As far as other people's deputies are concerned, particularly Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic deputies, I would like to report that they have appealed to all the country's servicemen—and I do not know how far they are entitled to do so—stating that no army should use weapons against its own people. I agree with this. But the appeal went on to present everything as if the Army should not take orders from its commanders, and so on. I believe that this appeal is unacceptable for strengthening both discipline and order in the Armed Forces, and appeals of this kind only disrupt the overall order in the Armed Forces.

Army Issue Disrupts Session

PM2609205190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondent I. Novikov: "How Freedom of Conscience Is Understood in Parliament"]

[Excerpts] A lull ensues even after a severe parliamentary storm. As distinct from the preceding days, a lull dominated the joint sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet's chambers 26 September.

However, it cannot be said that there was complete calm among the deputies in the hall. For the USSR draft law "On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations" was being discussed. [passage omitted]

The deputies examined the draft USSR Law "On Freedom of Conscience and Religious Organizations" article by article but did not have time to adopt the final version of it before the end of the sitting: Their discussion was "burst in upon" by an urgent question connected with the publication of the article "And Someone Thought Exercises Were Under Way..." in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 September.

Speaking about that article, Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, said:

"All the facts set forth in that article were fabricated. There were military exercises."

The minister even showed the deputies a map of the exercises and named the general in command of them.

In this connection it would not be a bad thing to recall that questions concerning the "suspicious" movements of military units have already arisen repeatedly at sittings of the new USSR Supreme Soviet during its brief history—which has prompted deputies to put questions to the USSR Ministry of Defense and the KGB. It should be pointed out that, in the present complex situation in the country, society listens with rapt attention to any

information of this kind. And so it was here. Once rumors emerged, they blazed in all directions.

And, naturally, the minister provided explanations. Since certain deputies insisted on an additional investigation, it was decided to pass the question on to the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions and the Committee for Questions of Glasnost.

One deputy drew attention to the article "Who Needs Rotting Potatoes" carried in PRAVDA 26 September. He pointed out that this alarming article suggests the need for an investigation at parliamentary level.

A.I. Lukyanov reported that he would inform the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation of this conversation. [passage omitted]

PRAVDA Describes Coup Rumors

PM2609205990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[Report by V. Izgarshev and Ye. Sorokin under the rubric "USSR Supreme Soviet Session": "On Freedom of Conscience and 'Freedom' of Rumors"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Rumors about troop movements in the environs of the capital have spread around Moscow in recent days. Some people unequivocally associated the actions of the military with the holding of a rally in Moscow 16 September. The hottest heads maintained that a military coup was being prepared and alleged a direct threat to the democratic gains of perestroyka.

At a recent meeting between leaders of the Russian government and the military with regard to these rumors, Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, made an official statement about their farfetched and ridiculous nature.

To all appearances, however, the marshal's statement did not provide proper clarity, and the rumors continued to acquire new details. The matter reached the sessions hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Addressing a meeting of the "Democratic Russian" block of deputies, USSR People's Deputy S. Belozertsev declared that he was ready to submit for his colleagues' examination tape recordings of testimonies by Soviet Army officers about the September troop movements around Moscow, but he was not given the floor at the session.

Yesterday KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA set forth all this for its readers, as well as other evidence of the facts of "strange" movements of military subunits near Moscow, in the article "And Someone Thought Exercises Were Under Way..."

At yesterday's sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet session the USSR minister of defense pointed out the following in connection with a question from People's Deputy S. Belozertsev and also a letter from a group of people's deputies writing in connection with the article in the youth newspaper.

First. During the night of 9-10 September, in accordance with an order by the commander of Moscow Military District dated 30 August, an airborne regiment really did arrive in Moscow from Ryazan on combat equipment. A similar regiment arrived from Kostroma 10 September. But by truck. The thing is that the first regiment will drive past in parade formation on combat equipment, and the second will march past on foot. As regards weapons and ammunition, members of airborne assault forces always have their weapons with them, wherever they go. On arrival, they surrender the ammunition to the depots.

Second. The road transport accident involving loss of life happened 11 September. An ensign in a private Zaporozhets collided with a military UAZ.

Third. Not a single company of the Vitebsk Airborne Division took a step toward Moscow.

Fourth. In practice, there is no F.E. Dzerzhinskiy Division of the Ministry of Internal Affairs at a permanent stationing location. As the division's command has reported, 2,050 men are serving in Nagornyy Karabakh, 350 are harvesting vegetables in Kazakhstan, and 1,300 are harvesting potatoes in Moscow Oblast. And only 1,000 servicemen are serving in Moscow and its oblast.

As regards the exercises, the defense minister showed the people's deputies the map of the exercise leader—Colonel General V. Achalov, commander of Airborne Troops—which had been approved by the chief of General Staff. And the marshal went on to report that 23,000 Moscow Military District servicemen are currently performing unpaid work in Moscow Oblast state and collective farm fields. Of course, they go to and from work in trucks, so there are and will be movements. But no one has set or could have set any troops—either airborne troops or others—any tasks such as breaking up a rally or intimidating anyone.

The people's deputies dealt a rebuff to attempts to draw them into a needless, empty debate on anti-Army topics. They took note of the USSR defense minister's report and, in this connection, gave specific instructions to the appropriate parliamentary committees. [passage omitted]

TASS Summarizes Supreme Soviet Proceedings

LD2709073390 Moscow TASS in English 0657 GMT 27 Sep 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksyonov, Boris Zverev, and Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—The Soviet parliament's two chambers held joint sessions during the first three days of this week. Heated debates resulted in the adoption of several major resolutions.

One of them, "On urgent measures to stabilise the national economy and on the programme for the transition to a market economy", instructed President Mikhail Gorbachev to speed the completion of the draft transition programme on the basis of several blueprints, already discussed in parliament.

Another resolution, which was adopted in the form of a law, provides for "additional measures to stabilise the economic, social and political life in the country".

The resolution delegated some of parliament's legislative powers to the president to enable him to "issue promptly normative decrees to strengthen the government system and law and order during the transition period".

On Tuesday, chairman of the Council of Nationalities Rafik Nishanov spoke about consultations on a new Union treaty.

Parliament adopted a resolution describing the future treaty as the "basis for a radical renewal of the Soviet Union and an important factor in society's efforts to overcome the crisis".

Parliament also accepted the president's proposal to set up a preparatory committee to work out the new Union treaty.

On Wednesday, legislators discussed the second reading of a bill on freedom of conscience and religious organisations.

The bill was expected to be adopted on Wednesday morning, but serious differences on a number of issues and the lack of a quorum at the afternoon session prompted legislators to put off the bill's discussion until Monday, when the two chambers will hold their next plenary session.

Today and on Friday, deputies will work in parliamentary committees and commissions.

'Marriage' of Ryzhkov, Shatalin Plans Considered

PM2709094890

[Editorial Report] London ITV Television Network in English at 1800 GMT on 24 September reports that today the Soviet Parliament gave President Gorbachev unprecedented powers to tackle the country's economic crisis. Correspondent David Smith reports from Moscow, on the Channel 4 "news" broadcast in a recorded report.

Smith reports that Gorbachev is trying to "marry" the two economic reform programs of Shatalin and Ryzhkov. Sergey Stankevich, a radical deputy, speaking in English says: "They are incompatible in principle, because presidential program—which is basically Shatalin's program—is for accelerated transition to the market. Governmental program, it is the same: Tweedledee, tweedle-dum, it's nothing. So, if we insist that it is presidential program that should be taken as guidepost, we can drop Ryzhkov's government."

The video report shows Soviet citizens standing in long food lines. Smith interviews them, then talks with Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin, who speaks in Russian with superimposed English translation. Smith asks: "Why are you opposed to the main 500 day program?" Abalkin replies: "It's not just what it's called. The program is unrealistic. It will be a complete economic failure, and it will create chaos in the country. I've said it openly: I think it's simply a populist program." Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, speaking in Russian with superimposed English translation says: "No program was adopted today—not Shatalin's program, not Gorbachev's, not Ryzhkov's. The decision taken today was to work out a program based on those three and to put the president in charge of that work." Smith asks: "Are you going to stay, come what may, Prime Minister?" Ryzhkov replies: "I will remain the leader of the government only if I believe that the program will work."

Smith reports that Gorbachev must show clear leadership in this crisis. He says: "Interestingly, even those close to him have been saying today that his plan to marry economic programs is a non-starter, and that supreme presidential power is his only hope." Nikolay Shishlin, of the CPSU Central Committee, speaking in English, says: "I am afraid that we'll speak about this marriage, but really this marriage can't happen. So I think the choice will be Shatalin's program." Smith asks: "The president wants emergency powers. What does he have in mind?" Shishlin responds: "Only to adopt special measures in order to push forward the policy of economic reform. Nothing else." Smith says: "In other words, he will become the sole arbiter of what happens on the economic front?" Shishlin answers: "In some ways, yes. Because it's simply impossible to wait when the Supreme Soviet will adapt, will adopt all the necessary laws, and it's necessary to use the presidential power."

Smith returns to Stankevich and asks: "What about Gorbachev's position?" Stankevich replies: "It's unclear, unfortunately. I think that he can lose his last chance—this is his last chance to take the risk, to take all responsibility upon himself, to confirm his open and strategic alliance with Yeltsin. This is his last chance."

Ryzhkov Questioned on Possibility of Resignation

AU2609082090 Bratislava SMENA in Slovak 20 Sep p 1

[Report on interview given by Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to an unspecified journalist by Jiri Doubrava, SMENA correspondent; in Moscow on 18 September: "Nikolay Ryzhkov Told us in the Kremlin: Compromise or I Will Resign"]

[Text] "Either a compromise will be reached in the proposals for economic reform, or I will resign," Nikolay

Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman, told our correspondent in Moscow on Tuesday [18 September]. Economic reform to bring the country to a market economy was again on the agenda on the second day of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The real issue here lies a long way away from the economy; it concerns, above all, fundamental questions of politics and power.

During the lunch break, Nikolay Ryzhkov unexpectedly appeared in the foyer. He evidently had decided to make his standpoints public, because he immediately asked whether there were any Soviet journalists among those present. Of the approximately half dozen journalists present at the beginning of this meeting, there was only one.... I select only the most important questions and answers of the half-hour discussion.

[Question] What is your opinion on the Sunday demonstration in Moscow during which the participants called for your resignation?

[Ryzhkov] According to my information and according to the television broadcast, there were many slogans. The Moscovites, however, should not get so carried away with meetings, they are good at that, they have learned that. They should also learn to manage their city. Nine million people with their concerns live in Moscow. They could begin by learning how to manage bakeries so as to end the bread shortages.

[Question] Where do you find more democracy—in the Supreme Soviet or in the street?

[Ryzhkov] Democracy is here, in the Supreme Soviet. There was very little democracy at the demonstration. As far as I know, more people wanted to take floor, but they were not permitted to do so. Do you call that democracy?

[Question] Do you believe that the parliament is still capable of solving all problems? Has the situation not gone too far? There are claims that nobody is in control of the country.

[Ryzhkov] I do not think that all is lost. The country must have somebody in control, or no policy can save it. Neither Shatalin's, nor Ryzhkov's policy. The country must have order and discipline. That does not mean a dictatorship but ordinary, elementary order.

[Question] Should parliament adopt the policy submitted by Academician Aganbegyan, will your government implement it?

[Ryzhkov] Not as it stands now.

[Question] Does that mean that you will resign?

[Ryzhkov] Academician Abalkin spoke about it. There are points with which we disagree. It is Shatalin's policy with some of the least popular measures removed.

[Question] How do you explain the fact that President Gorbachev prefers Shatalin's policy which, as he said, is more realistic.

[Ryzhkov] He made this statement earlier, I do not believe he spoke like that on Monday [17 September]. That he supports Aganbegyan? Well, I have my own opinion.

[Question] Can a compromise be reached?

[Ryzhkov] I believe that the Supreme Soviet can find one. After all we agree on more than a half of the issues.

[Question] Are you ready and willing to implement such a proposal with concessions?

[Ryzhkov] If I agree with it, then yes. But only then.

[Question] Do you have the support of the Communist Party?

[Ryzhkov] The party is now in a special situation. It is in a stage of searching for a way. I could use its help, but I do not feel any.

[Question] Hence, if the government policy is not adopted, you will resign?

[Ryzhkov] I have already told you twenty times and perhaps even thirty times: I will implement that in which I believe, nothing else. Only if find a compromise—and that should happen.

[Question] In the event you resign, what would you do?

[Ryzhkov] What should I do? I will be 61 years old. I simply resign, and that is it.

'Additional Powers' for Gorbachev Examined

PM2609151990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Sep 90 Second Edition p 1

[Article by Georgiy Ovcharenko under the rubric "What They Are Talking About": "Moment of Decisions and Actions"]

[Text] The conflict which recently flared up (according to unverified rumor) between the two—Russian and Union—Supreme Soviets was just as rapidly cleared up by a television transmission from the sitting of the session of the country's parliamentarians. But the telephones continue to ring in the editorial office: "Has Gorbachev been given unrestricted power?" "Is it true that the Union parliaments are being dissolved?" "The president should have banged his fist long ago!"

But one question was repeated more often than the others: "But what actually lies behind the conflict?" Having begun to answer, I suddenly caught myself thinking that it is also essential to understand what lies behind the actual question put by the man on the line.

But first a brief word about the situation which gave rise to the talk and which always arises when one side makes use not of facts but of rumors and stories.

Last Friday evening at a sitting of the Union parliament it was suggested that for the period of the transition to

the market the USSR president be invested with additional powers. To wit that he be given the right to issue decrees concerning the economy and law and order and aimed at stabilizing the situation in the country. It was also said that the country's parliament, if it disagrees with a decision of the president's, retains the right to have the final word.

The next day the Russian parliament was in turmoil, like bees about to be removed from their hive. The reason? His own and, to put it mildly, not very accurate interpretation by N. Travkin, a deputy of the two Supreme Soviets, of what had been proposed at the Union parliament. According to him the president had threatened the sovereignty of the republics and their economic and political independence, after which the Russian deputies started to speculate when the sailor Zheleznyak [not further identified] would appear before them with his famous words about the tired guard. Thus, in the panic—I can find no other word for it—it was decided to adopt an RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] resolution in defense of the constitution and Russia's sovereignty. And perhaps they would have adopted it without essentially investigating the thrust of the matter, but there was no quorum. But then the Russian Parliament Presidium assumed the responsibility and adopted a similar statement which was read out that same evening on the "Vremya" program.

Without having any reliable information, the public immediately rose up against dictatorship and in defense of democracy. Incidentally, for me personally this was a gratifying fact: It speaks of the irreversibility of the democratic transformations and the people's readiness to defend them.

But something else is incomprehensible: Even yesterday there were telephone calls asking for an explanation of what stands behind the USSR Supreme Soviet decision to grant the USSR president additional powers. It is as though Ye. Primakov, member of the Presidential Council, had not spoken on Sunday on that same "Vremya" program, as though television had not transmitted on Monday the sitting of the Union session during which M. Gorbachev himself explained that he assesses his additional powers primarily as the head of state's additional responsibility for the situation in the country.

Nonetheless in the telephone calls to the editorial office one can discern the desire to read between the lines. And I am sure people will be found who will read and hear what they want. And who will turn everything upside down and excite people, heating still further the tense situation in the country. Is this necessary for a society before whom there already looms because, I shall say without embarrassment, of the paralysis of power and the irresponsibility of many "responsible people," the threat of hunger and cold this winter? Hardly....

I think that in their overwhelming majority people will approve the USSR Supreme Soviet's delegation of additional powers in the sphere of the economy and law and order to the country's president. And it is not only that a section of society, tired of the mounting disorder in all fields of our life, is demanding a "strong hand." The main thing is that an understanding is coming of the fact that any program, even an ideal one, to normalize our economy will be crushed unless society achieve the consolidation of forces for its implementation.

Discipline and order—those are the conditions without which we cannot implement a single program. And another condition—obedience to the law. But you will agree that these conditions do not exist today. And while approving the decisions of the USSR Supreme Soviet I, for instance, wonder how it will be implemented in practice. After all, we have already known of cases when presidential decrees remained hanging in midair, to put it mildly. Will something similar not happen to the president's additional powers?

I am afraid because the transitional period to the market economy is the most complex, the most dangerous. Here there are not precise boundaries between the legal and the illegal—I do not doubt that this fact will be used by the dealers in the shadow economy in order once more, perhaps for the last time, to fill their pockets. In these confused times it looks as though we cannot avoid disturbances among that section of the population which feels defenseless in the fact of market prices—and strikes will aggravate still further the situation in the economy. It is not ruled out that nationalist elements will be activated which, under cover of slogans of the peoples' sovereignty and independence, will make a last attempt to divide the federation into khanates and principalities in order to rule there....

That is why in my view the question today is: Will we help the president and thus ourselves in this minute of difficulty for the country or will we not?

The moment for decisions and actions has come.

Political & Social

Council of Ministers Debates Harvest Crisis

PM2509141190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the rubric "Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow": "In the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] It was noted with particular alarm at the extended session of the USSR Council of Ministers—held 22 September with the participation of Union republics—that a critical situation has arisen in many regions in the country as regards the conclusion of the harvest work. This has been caused not only by the unfavorable weather conditions, but also by a lack of organization, a fall in discipline, and a lack of coordination between the actions of urban and rural organs of administrative power. A direct threat of losing a significant part of the produce in the fields has arisen, as well as breakdowns in

procurements of grain for state stocks and in deliveries of potatoes and vegetables that are to be put into storage for the winter.

The situation regarding the shipment of fruits, vegetables and potatoes to large industrial centers, and particularly to Moscow and Leningrad, is highly unsatisfactory.

Bearing in mind the whole acuteness of the situation that has developed, the USSR Council of Ministers believes that the governments of Union and autonomous republics and the executive committees of kray and oblast soviets of people's deputies should immediately adopt the most decisive measures all the way to introducing a state of emergency if need be, in order to save the harvest that has been cultivated.

Republic and local organs have been instructed to urgently adopt decisions on bringing in additional workers, employees, engineers, and technicians from industrial and other enterprises for gathering the harvest. To this end, they have been instructed in individual cases to temporarily suspend the work of a number of institutions and organizations, and to dispatch the necessary number of trucks and other means of transport for the shipment of agricultural products, irrespective of which department owns these transport means. In order to stimulate the workers employed in the gathering of the harvest, it has been recommended that the leaders of agricultural enterprises use effective incentives including the extensive use of remuneration in kind.

The USSR Council of Ministers has made it incumbent on all ministries and departments that provide for the production of material and technical resources for the countryside to establish the most stringent monitoring of their deliveries during the period of the conclusion of the harvest work in order to prevent any interruptions in the supply of fuel, packaging, and other materials.

The USSR Defense Ministry has been instructed to give effective assistance in the gathering of the harvest and the transportation of agricultural produce by making available the efforts of military subdivisions, services, and military training establishments. The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has been instructed to put a stop to any illegal actions by people involved in the buying of agricultural produce for resale, as well as in extortion and in disrupting deliveries and trading.

At the conclusion of the session, N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, paid particular attention to the need to consolidate the efforts of union and republic organs in the resolution of issues connected with conclusion of the fall field work, the fulfillment of state orders for deliveries of grain and supplies of fruit, vegetables, and potatoes. The provision of food products to the population will depend on this to a great extent. A number of proposals were voiced on the procedure and conditions for creating and using an all-Union food fund and republic food funds in 1991.

A resolution was adopted on the issues that were discussed, which will be published in the press.

Emergency Harvest Decree Issued

PM2709103190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Unattributed report: "In USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] On 26 September the USSR Council of Ministers adopted a resolution on urgent measures to complete the harvest and to step up purchases of grain, fruit and vegetables, and potatoes in 1990.

The USSR Council of Ministers notes that in many regions of the country the situation with regard to the harvesting work has been aggravated. As a result of unfavorable weather conditions and in a number of places because of lack of organization, slack discipline, and lack of coordination in the actions of city and rural organs of power and management, a direct threat has arisen that a considerable proportion of the agricultural produce which has been grown will perish. The harvesting of potatoes and vegetables and the procurement and shipment of this produce to major industrial centers, especially to Moscow and Leningrad, is being conducted extremely slowly.

Individual kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms], with real opportunities for increasing the sale of grain, are failing to fulfill their contract commitments for deliveries of grain to state resources, which is complicating the formation of the all-Union and republican grain stocks and could lead to serious difficulties in supplying the population with bread and bread products and to the nonfulfillment of the planned volume of mixed feed production for livestock raising.

Considering the situation which has developed with regard to completing the harvest and procurements of agricultural produce to be absolutely unacceptable, the USSR Council of Ministers decrees:

1. That the governments of the Union and autonomous republics and kray, oblast, and rayon soviet of people's deputies executive committees be asked to immediately examine the entire complex of questions connected with the completion of the harvest and procurement of agricultural produce and take emergency measures to save the harvest which has been raised. Where necessary the following must be additionally enlisted to complete the harvesting work:

workers, employees, engineering and technical and other workers from enterprises, institutions, and organizations right up to the temporary suspension of the work of some institutions and organizations;

trucks (with drivers) and other means of transport from enterprises, institutions, and organizations irrespective of their departmental subordination.

It must be deemed expedient for students at higher educational establishments, secondary specialized educational establishments, and vocational and technical colleges to take part in the harvesting work in October 1990 while retaining the conditions stipulated by Point 3 of the USSR Council of Ministers 3 August 1990 Resolution No. 765.

2. That it be recommended to the kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises that with a view to encouraging workers, including those brought in, engaged in bringing in the harvest and in procurements and the transportation of agricultural produce, they take steps for their material encouragement, including the broad use of payment in kind for labor, with the produce being issued immediately.

3. The USSR Defense Ministry must render the local soviet and economic organs effective aid in bringing in the harvest and transporting agricultural produce using the forces of military subunits and services and military educational establishments.

4. The USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] and the ministries and departments that ensure the production of material and technical resources for the countryside must establish the strictest control over the progress in their delivery for the completion of the harvest work, paying special attention to preventing any stoppages in the supply of fuel, containers, packaging, and other materials.

5. The USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases, the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers, Belorussian SSR Council of Ministers, and Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers, proceeding from the state order established by the USSR Supreme Soviet 31 October 1989 resolution "on the state plan for the USSR's economic and social development for 1990," must ensure by 1 November 1990 the sale of grain to state stocks by kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises within the stipulated volumes.

The USSR Government urges the labor collectives of the kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the North Caucasus, Central Chernozem, Urals, and West Siberian regions of the RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR, the Kazakh SSR, and other regions of the country which have grown a good harvest to weigh up their potential once again and sell the state as much grain as possible over and above their contract commitments.

6. The governments of the Union and autonomous republics and local soviet of people's deputies executive committees, with a view to encouraging the fulfillment and overfulfillment of contract commitments for grain deliveries to state resources, must make full use of opportunities for cross-sales to kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agricultural enterprises of material and technical resources and goods in short supply earmarked for the purpose by decisions of the USSR Government.

In connection with the fact that in some oblasts, krays, and republics there have been instances of the violation of the established procedure for the cross-sale of material and technical resources to farms in exchange for grain sold to the state over and above the contract commitments, the USSR Gossnab and the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases have been instructed to recommend to the Union republic governments that they indicate the people (from the ranks of the leaders of central and republican organs) who are personally responsible for ensuring that the resources earmarked for this purpose are used strictly as intended.

7. The Central Union of Consumer Societies and the republic, kray, and oblast consumer unions must resolutely activate work on the purchase of potatoes and fruit and vegetables from the population and on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and on the organization of its shipment to major cities and industrial centers.

8. The soviet of people's deputies executive committees of Moscow, Leningrad, and other major cities and industrial centers must immediately form task forces consisting of vigorous, enterprising workers and send them to the places where agricultural produce is being procured, investing them with the necessary powers in resolving questions of the purchase of potatoes and vegetables and their organized dispatch to their own regions.

9. It must be deemed expedient to retain the existing procedure for using state grain stocks from the 1990 harvest.

It must be established that the instructions of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Food and Purchases on questions of the accumulation, transportation, and use of state grain stocks are compulsory for all organizations, irrespective of their departmental subordination.

10. The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs must intercept any illegal actions by people engaging in the extortion, embezzlement, or resale of agricultural production and the disorganization of shipments and trade.

IZVESTIYA Ponders 'Collapse' of Central Power

PM2609094190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Article by candidate of historical sciences A. Migranyan under the rubric: "Social Forecast": "Indestructible Union? On the Prospects for Soviet Statehood"]

[Text] In the past few months we have witnessed colossal changes in the political sphere which, it seems to me, have not been fully understood either by the country's public or by the political leadership. There has been a double collapse of the center. It collapsed as a result of the organizational emergence of right-wing and left-wing

forces. The former yearn for the old party-state structures, which are losing their prestige in the eyes of the people, while the latter are drawn toward the newly elected Soviets. The political center of the USSR has outlived its usefulness. We still have not fully realized the scale and significance of what is going on, perhaps not least because it came straight after the decision to concentrate tremendous power in the hands of the newly elected president.

After Yeltsin's election as chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet and the proclamation of the declaration on Russian sovereignty, all the central Union institutions seemed to be out of a job. However, it was presumed that the switch to democracy and the market would take place on a Union scale and under the guidance of the present leadership from the center. The priorities were determined accordingly: to begin by making perestroyka in the economic and political spheres irreversible and only then resolve the Union's fate on the basis of new political and economic principles and relations. Otherwise, the argument ran, centrifugal tendencies in the republics would create fertile soil for the consolidation of conservative forces, which, exploiting the threat of the disintegration of the country, would take us back to the starting point of stagnation. That is why when choosing between the alternatives—first the restructuring of the Union through the creation of a confederation or through its disbandment, with the national republics acquiring independence, and then democratization and the market on the scale of the country as a whole—preference was given to the second scenario for development.

Events in the country, however, developed according to the first scenario. The logical conclusion was the Baltic republics' declarations on seceding from the USSR. Until recently, all these processes threatened perestroyka itself with the possibility of a repetition of the Chinese and Romanian events. And if that did not happen, it was solely thanks to the gradual strengthening of Gorbachev's real power through his acquisition of additional powers, the elimination of the old CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, the change in the role of the Politburo, and the transfer of the center of power to the Presidential Council.

But although the reformist leadership blocked the possibility of a right-wing coup [perevorot], it virtually let go of the reins of government at local level. Reformist forces in the republics surged ahead and made themselves independent of all external structures. The central authorities were left without levers to implement their decisions not only in the national republics but—after the declaration of Russian sovereignty—in Russia too. Russia's decision to gain independence is a simply epoch-making event unparalleled in the state's 1,000-year history. It means a complete reappraisal of all the supreme values which underpinned the existence first of autocratic Russia then of bolshevik Russia. This is essentially a repudiation of the idea of "divine election," "exclusiveness," and "messianism."

But how has the real situation developed since the declaration of Russian and then Ukrainian and Belorussian sovereignty? The ground has been cut from under the feet of the Union institutions of power. The power crisis has reached its peak. After the declarations of full economic and political sovereignty by the new state organs, the 28th Party Congress effectively enshrined the principle of the federalization of the CPSU itself. The only institution ensuring the unity of the country and giving real power to the president was thus the Army, which incidentally is also experiencing within itself a confrontation between progressive and conservative forces.

The collapse of the center did not only affect the USSR. It was also clearly felt in the case of the Russian Federation and even in those republics which are relatively ethnically homogeneous, where the old institutions and values that are being discredited are not giving way without a fight to new ones, which do not have sufficient prestige in the eyes of the people and lower state structures. The idea that everything has to be restructured from the bottom to the top has led to republics challenging the Union, cities and oblasts challenging the republics, and rayons challenging the cities. In these conditions how is it possible to ensure that the decisions of higher soviets are fulfilled by lower ones?

It seems to me that our democrats could be victims of that straightforward 18th century rationalism which held that society was a mechanism which could be built according to a blueprint. Marxists were victims of that illusion in the realm of theory, Bolsheviks in the realm of practice. But even now the illusion persists that it is possible to invert the pyramid of power and build it from the bottom up. We are entering a further stage in building society and the state in accordance with so-called "common sense." Nowhere and at no time in the world have there been states built from the bottom up, nowhere has it been said that local management organs can take as much power as they want and transfer to the upper echelons as much as they deem necessary. Throughout the world the democratic political system has been formed on the basis of an agonizing and protracted redistribution of authority and powers from the top down, never the other way around.

Our attempts to create from scratch all the institutions of state on a contract basis are attempts to realize yet another grandiose utopia which will leave society deprived of an organizing linchpin. This will lead not to the triumph of democracy but to utter disorganization and chaos in the country. Strange as it may seem, democracy means not just free elections and the supremacy of the people, not just pluralism of political interests but also a strict system of state subordination with a precise allocation of powers which are observed not only by decrees and resolutions but by the power structures of higher organs elected by the people and enjoying their support.

Let us return to the situation in the Russian Federation. The bomb planted under the USSR by the declaration of Russian sovereignty, it seems to me, is helping to destroy not just the USSR but—to an even greater degree—Russia itself. The consistent democratic principles put forward by Yeltsin and the Russian parliament acknowledging the equal rights of all national-territorial formations as subjects of the Russian Federation immediately raise a number of problems after declarations of sovereignty by, for example, the Khanty-Mansiysk Autonomous Okrug and the Tatar ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. Where are the geographical borders of the republic which is supposed to represent the ethnic Russians? How will its organs of power be created and where? Who will sign the union agreement in the framework of the present RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and with whom? What will happen to the subjects of the present federation if they do not want to join the new union, which, in uniting all national-territorial formations on an equal basis, can hardly be called Russia? What will be the position of the RSFSR if not only the national-territorial formations but also the territories want to be sovereign not only economically but politically too? After all, even with their present undeveloped economic ties, the Maritime Kray region, the Urals, and other regions are quite capable of becoming autonomous state formations. In conditions where there are no common state institutions or values and no organic economic links during the transition to the market, where is the guarantee that these regions will look toward each other rather than, for example, toward Japan, South Korea, or China in the east, or Finland and northern Europe in the west?

Even such a cursory examination of the possible development of events shows clearly that it is not only the political center of the union but also the center of the RSFSR that will collapse in the near future. That is the general political background against which the debates have been developing at the recently opened sessions of the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets. The president and the supreme organs of legislative and executive power are trying to elaborate mechanisms for the transition to the market and further democratization on the scale of the USSR—a state which effectively does not exist. In that case both the government program and the programs prepared on the orders of the two presidents will be ineffective. Even though the program elaborated under the leadership of Academician Shatalin takes greater account of the current realities in relations between the center and the republics, nevertheless, it too, judging by the debates at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, fails to consider the full depth of the crisis of the power structures. And when the final collapse of the political center of the union occurs, which is what the process in the country is steadily moving toward, no single structure at any level will be able to implement any program whatsoever.

By all accounts, the tendency of higher organs of power to revoke the decisions of lower ones will continue. But since the higher organs have no effective ability to implement their decisions and the lower ones do not recognize the legitimacy of the former's decisions, clearly the decisions of the center will continue to be ignored, thus intensifying the discrediting of the power structures.

Perhaps in this confrontation the position of Yeltsin and the Russian parliament is somewhat preferable. If, as they expect, they succeed in adopting by the beginning of next year a new Russian Constitution which enshrines the right to elect the Russian president on the basis of direct suffrage from a number of alternative candidates, the point and significance of the union after Yeltsin's election as president will be nullified or else Gorbachev will be forced to run against Yeltsin for the Russian presidency. However, such an outcome is possible only if the disintegration of the Russian Federation is halted. Otherwise, the national-territorial and territorial formations which have gained their political and economic independence will hardly want to vote even for a president of Russia. And even the concept of "Russia" as a collective entity is already being called into question because there are many national-state formations existing in that geographical space.

It is not hard to imagine that in the prevailing conditions economic and social chaos will increase, no presidential or prime ministerial programs will have any chance of success, and Western aid will become even more problematical while at the same time the crises in the economic, social, and political spheres will increase. If the central organs of power—the president, the congress, and Supreme Soviet—try to ensure their own survival by making concessions, that in my view will still not be able to weaken the powerful tendency toward demarcation.

In this process of confrontation, the only instrument in the president's hands—the Army—may be demoralized if all the national-territorial formations decide to create their own military formations and stop the draft for the Soviet Army. In conditions of these political crises of the transitional period, it is the demoralization of the Army, the final institution stabilizing the state and preserving its integrity, that will signal the beginning of interethnic clashes and be the harbinger of civil war.

What is the way out of this situation? First, it must be acknowledged that the shift of power from the center to the republics and below at the present stage has raised the problem of reassessing priorities. Today the impotence of the center has slowed the transition to the market and the continuation of democratization. The very rapid separation of national-territorial formations and the individual solutions of the problems which faced the center but were not resolved is the only possible way out of the crisis. The new political instruments and leaders who still enjoy people's trust could be used here. They alone can begin the process of creating new economic relations. Because it is absolutely obvious that it is impossible to determine from a single center the pace of change, the degree of readiness of the infrastructure, and

the consistency of the steps in this direction in the various republics and regions.

Second, the central authorities must finally take preemptive actions. First, in my view, they should elaborate the principle of the new national-territorial demarcation and try to secure consensus on this question among the main subjects of the USSR. Otherwise it is impossible to disband the union since with the removal of the union center the remaining national-territorial formations will be left in an even worse position than the national republics are within the USSR.

Third, there is an urgent need to replace the existing union institutions by the creation of a Coordinating Committee, possibly under the leadership of the current president and with the participation of all representatives of the national-territorial formations, so as to meet halfway the trends toward autonomy and sovereignty that are gaining momentum.

Fourth, in conditions of interethnic conflicts, the removal of the center would lead to the "Lebanonization" of the country. Therefore, I think, it would be worth thinking about the need to create in the transitional period interethnic armed forces (along the lines of the UN peacekeeping forces) under the Coordinating Committee's leadership with the aim of preventing the development of interethnic conflicts on the territory of the former union. Perhaps in this transitional period the future relations between the republics will also take shape. Be that as it may, the center's main task today is to ensure the least painful disbandment of the union in its old form so that the various republics and regions can find ways to organize themselves and organize forms of cooperation or ties with other republics and regions as quickly as possible. For this the center must fundamentally change its role and functions and try not to administer but to coordinate links and help the old empire to disband itself.

Is there another way out of the situation? There is, but it is hardly acceptable to the present reformist leadership. It is not simply the empire that is falling apart of its own accord but the ideology which bound the union together. The ideas of national independence and self-determination are prevailing everywhere over ideas which have outlived their usefulness, but at the moment there are no new, powerful, or attractive ideas. In these circumstances the fate of the union will largely depend on the character of the Russian national self-awareness. The ideas of great-power Russian nationalism—the orientation toward a particular path, isolationism, the rejection of Western institutions and values, and so forth—are being defeated. However, if the renewal of the Union is delayed now and the crisis which has made the country virtually ungovernable becomes protracted, it cannot be ruled out that even the new structures in the republics and regions will not be able to resolve the economic and social problems and will lose the people's confidence until they manage to achieve a tangible improvement in the population's socioeconomic situation, especially in Russia. And as a result the great-power Russian national idea may be used to restore the integrity of the country, of a united and indivisible Russia which will replace the indestructible Union.

Whatever decisions the USSR and RSFSR Supreme Soviets adopt at their September sessions, the deputies must realize that these decisions cannot be delayed. May God grant our people's elected representatives and the country's reformist leadership the wisdom to see the chasm into which we are rushing ful' .ilt before it is too late.

'Center Bloc' Holds News Conference 19 Sep

90UN2860A Moscow TRUD in Russian 20 Sep 90 p 2

[Report on 19 September news conference with "centrist bloc of political parties and movements" by Yu. Kryuchkov: "The Ministers' Names Are a Secret"]

[Text] A center bloc of political parties and movements held its first news conference yesterday. And it is perfectly logical that V. Voronin, chairman of the bloc's organizing committee, first read to the journalists the list of parties and movements which constitute this new bloc: After all, we were, to be honest, hearing about some of them for the first time.

So: the Liberal Democratic Party, the A.D. Sakharov Union of Democratic Forces, the Peace Party, the Democratic Party, the Popular Constitutional Party, the "Blue Movement," the Russian Popular Front, the Meskhetian Turks Society, the "Rossiya" Association, the "Vozrozhdeniye" Soviet Germans Society, the Russian Democratic Party and the Popular Information Party.... On what principles did their "bloc-forming" occur? All these parties believe that human rights should be afforded everyone, that is, citizens of the country; that party aims must be achieved without violence, only by the legitimate path; and that social forces of the far left and the far right mean extremism, which is absolutely impermissible in our state.

The most sensational news was that the center bloc is currently engaged in the formation of a new Union government—coalition—consisting of the representatives of various parties of the country and thus capable of being a government of national unity. Of the present ministers, only one out of every four is included in the new body, and altogether 22 ministry and department leaders, whose names are still "classified," are proposed; soon the list will be presented to the USSR president and Supreme Soviet for consideration. One name was made public yesterday, nonetheless. The center bloc proposes Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Sobchak, who has already consented in principle to move from Leningrad to Moscow, for the office of chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

In response to journalists' requests that they be informed of additional details concerning members of the coalition government, it was said that their average age is 48, that they represent seven political parties, that one out of every three is a nonparty person, and that the proposed cabinet is to contain two women.

What is the center bloc's attitude toward the "500 days" economic program? A very good one; it wants this program to succeed. However, for the contingency of its failure the bloc is currently devising a set of "rescue" measures. Among the bloc's immediate political tasks is preventing extreme forces coming to power. However, we will learn about the center bloc's political and economic goals in more detail at a forum of democratic forces to be organized at the end of the year in Moscow in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses.

One question was very sharp: How many supporters do the parties that have joined the bloc have? Vladimir Vasilyevich Voronin had to "confess": Arithmetical tallies have not been made. "And, altogether, quality is more important here, not quantity."

Could such an army of "centrists," even united in a bloc, not only compile a list for a new cabinet of ministers, but also bring these ministers into the cabinet? We suggest that the readers themselves formulate the answer to this question.

Democratic, Marxist Platform Leaders Present Views

LD2609202390 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Mocow September 26 TASS—The members of the Democratic Platform (reform-minded communists) and the Marxist Platform in the CPSU consider themselves communists, not social democrats, although they are confident that the communist movement is not a certain exclusive sect basing itself on some hard-and-fast principles, Andrey Kolganov, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, told a joint news conference today on behalf of the two platforms.

Following the CPSU's 28th Congress held in summer this year, some members of the Democratic Platform decided to withdraw from the party ranks while the others, including reform-minded communists, refused to break away from the party and decided to work for its renewal.

The members of the Democratic and Marxist Platforms believe that the communist movement as contemporary political current should be open and assimilate the experience of the entire left-wing socialist and democratic movement in the world and should not have any prejudices against the utilization of the positive experience of social democracy or other socialist movements.

They do not renounce a communist or socialist future, since to them "it is not a set of ethical principles but is some new social set-up which we expect to reach".

At the same time they believe that the structure of a future society should be built only with due regard for the experience of the entire world civilization and with drawing on the practice-tested social set-up elements which accord with universal human values.

Participants in the news conference voiced concern "over the increased activity of conservative forces and the growth of liquidationist sentiment among communists".

They pointed to the coincidence of views and positions on a number of principled matters. Specific forms to coordinate action are expected to be worked out at an all-union conference to be held in November this year.

Afanasyev on Role of 'Democratic Forces' Group

PM2609134890 London MOSCOW NEWS in English No 17, 21-26 Sep 90 p 10

[Interview with Yuriy Afanasyev of the Interregional Group of People's Deputies by Len Karpinskiy: "Too Free... Too Soon. The Great Debate Over the Role and Place of Democracy in the Soviet Union Today"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] After the demise of the old comes the shock of the new. As the old system is dismantled, a void is left in its place and we must wait to see whether the nascent democratic forces in the Soviet Union are capable of filling it. Here, Moscow News Political Analyst Len Karpinskiy talks to Yuriy Afansyev of the radical Inter-Regional group of Peoples Deputies about the specific tasks facing the democratic movement.

The discussion was opened by Len Karpinskiy: The Inter-Regional Group of USSR People's Deputies has decided to set up a Forum of Democratic Forces—that is, a rallying point for democrats. What can come of this?

Yuriy Afanasyev: You need to look at the present situation to understand the role of a Forum of Democratic Forces. I'm talking about the deep-rooted forces hindering the progress of social change, of which there are at least four.

Firstly, Communism has ceased to be a viable alternative, and is therefore no longer a threat to the rest of civilisation. So a world previously structured around confrontation is changing character.

However, the Soviet economy and Soviet society as a whole was structured with a view to confrontation. This structure hinders our attempts to integrate into the modern world—technologically, economically and socially.

The Soviet Union was designed as a unifying empire, an omnipotent superstate; one factory, one mammoth production line comprising many large regions. For example, the whole of Soviet Central Asia was devoted to growing a single crop: cotton. Now we are faced with a monstrous distortion of the entire region, ruined ecology and suffering people.

We should make a concerted effort to overcome these problems, but the enforced unification of the Soviet period has resulted in a widespread movement supporting individual sovereignty. Thus, the support we should give each other is being withheld.

Another obstacle to progress is posed by the military-industrial complex. According to estimates, over 80 per cent of the country's machine-building facilities are involved in military production.

The war industry is based on directive management—so while we are eager to become a market economy, we have a military-industrial complex which cannot be dealt with by market forces. It has to be reformed by the same administrative methods as before.

Finally, our citizens have only ever been employed by the state. Chairman of the Moscow City Soviet Gavriil Popov recently cited cases where managers of state-owned shops refused offers to convert their shops to private businesses because this would involve risk, responsibility, and constant worries about the future. Civil society is under-developed because it lacks a proper economic basis.

Karpinskiy: You mentioned a key issue: a void in the country's social sphere which is as conspicuous as the absence of food in the shops.

As the old regime's social machinery is painstakingly dismantled piece by piece, the absence of other structures becomes evident. A vacuum is left in its place. The democratic movement is undergoing a serious test: will it be able to create "cosmos out of chaos"?

Afanasyev: The alternative to a rallying of democratic forces would be the untrammelled growth of reactionary power structures, and the ascendance of men like Ivan Polozkov - from high-ranking military men to the senior managers of the military-industrial complex and the agricultural bosses, who run the semi-feudal state and collective farms.

Karpinskiy: Practical experience shows that market forces can only take root in this country when bureaucratic structures are uprooted. The market economy must take the place of those structures. It is absurd to suggest that the existing laws on reform have got stuck in the mud because other laws are needed to enforce them. This opens the way to a fetishisation of the law.

I would remind you of the maxim: "It is more important to organise power than to seize it".

Perhaps the Forum of Democratic Forces - with an eye to the future - should insist on economic reform right away and try to push the authorities into taking practical steps in that direction.

Afanasyev: I agree. The united democratic movement must be both constructive and radical. It will have to encompass the usual political spectrum - including conservative elements - but within the framework of democracy, which by definition has no single political identity. There must be a right wing and left wing, as well as the centre.

Karpinskiy: This is very true. During the first stages of perestroika, the public was conscious only of the conflict between democratically minded people and the conservatives. Today the spectrum has become more clear-cut.

Political pluralism is acceptable and effective only as a lever promoting development within democracy. We have not shed the conservative wing of perestroika, only its direct opponents, reactionaries who have no alternative but to leave the historical stage.

Afanasyev: In keeping with its principles, the democratic movement must represent various different interests. For example, social protection for the weak within a democracy presupposes freedom for the strong.

No one has ever demanded a long leash for the strong, the capable or the entrepreneurs in this country. If we only gear our democracy towards protecting the weak we will never advance beyond the present level of poverty.

Karpinskiy: So far, the democratic movement has just passed through the initial stages of development. The main task then was the manifestation of various interests and goals which were simply suppressed in the past. Now, however, the democratic movement has begun practical work for the consolidation of fragile civil structures.

We criticise Gorbachev for his wariness vis-a-vis the radical democratic wing of perestroika. But he must sometimes survey the democratic forces which he himself brought into being and wonder which ones he can now rely upon. I don't see many.

Afanasyev: Yes, the opposing forces are still very unequal. The skeletal structure of officialdom, still intact with all its ministries, departments and uncontrollable finances, still outweighs our young democracy, which lacks any clearly defined social-economic or political programme.

Karpinskiy: I now recall my formative ideas about democracy with a bitter smile. It almost seemed as if it was enough merely to say the coveted word for it then to become a reality. But now I see we must painstakingly develop structures which can channel the work of those interested in democratisation.

Afanasyev: There's no doubt about it. I think (Anatoliy) Sobchak (chairman of Leningrad City Soviet) and Popov

understand this better than anybody else, as they have to confront the weakness of the country's democracy in their everyday work. The current notion of the strength of democracy merely reflects the number of People's Deputies claiming to owe allegiance to the democratic bloc. In fact, it is precisely these deputies who are stalling the work of the City Soviets in Moscow and Leningrad.

Karpinskiy: It's time we abandon the naive belief that everyone claiming to be a democrat behaves like one. Some despotic figures now call themselves democrats, an overnight transformation.

Afanasyev: It is not only a case of hypocrites like them. People who find themselves in the Russian parliament are often motivated - in their own view - by the most noble of intentions, yet they act without a proper consensus.

Karpinskiy: It is therefore necessary to give a clear explanation of the united democratic movement and its members.

Afanasyev: I visualise it as comprising three vertical structures extending from the interrepublican down to the lowest regional levels. Firstly it should include all political parties that call themselves democratic or gravitate towards democratic principles.

Secondly, it should include democratic factions in the Soviets at all levels. Thirdly, there are all kinds of movements whose orientation is close to that of the democratic bloc. I mean Memorial, the April group and various environmental movements. At the moment they are working separately, without concerting their actions.

Karpinskiy: You are a co-chairman of the Inter-Regional Group of People's Deputies. I believe your group initiated the drive for a democratic forum.

Afanasyev: Yes, and I think that was a very natural thing to do. The group has long been gravitating towards initiatives outside parliament.

Karpinskiy: Does that mean that the group will be part of the future Forum's control structure?

Afanasyev: "Control" is a word which has gone out of fashion. Even the word "co-ordination" should be used carefully. The idea at the very core of the movment is that each member will be sovereign. However, sovereignty will not hamper consolidation. It's unlikely that we can form a movement spreading all over the USSR. Instead, we will maintain close links at the interrepublican level.

Karpinskiy: It is up to the forum to map out its work, but how do you yourself visualise it?

Afanasyev: I see it like this: for the present, the programme of privatisation is the most difficult task of all. Clearly defined idea about the procedures of privatisation are lacking. We also lack forces capable of setting the mechanism of privatisation in motion while at the same time maintaining civil peace and consensus. This is the vast civil responsibility of democracy. Rash steps can only result in social strife.

During a recent meeting of the Inter-Regional Group we discussed the need to protect Moscow and Leningrad's efforts to promote democracy. Examples of something little short of an economic blockade were cited at the meeting.

Karpinskiy: I don't need to mention the gloating that goes on: "Look what's happened now they've come to power!"

Afanasyev: There is a lot of that, even in publications produced by the Central Committee. I saw a photograph of an old woman standing by the empty shelves in a bread shop with the caption: "A new present for Muscovites from the Moscow City Soviet."

However, disorganisation of a political nature causes even worse problems. The western Ukraine fails to supply sugar to Moscow, while the USSR people's deputies from the area speak about the failure to supply oil and oil products there. This kind of dispute could sooner or later result in chaos, so I think the democratic movement must get the situation under control.

Karpinskiy: The idea of creating democratic "forces of quick reaction" in crisis situations seems to be an urgent priority. When you spoke about the prospects for the next few decades, it occurred to me that the current situation is critical and very dangerous. If our democracy fails to prove its strength to neutralise anti-perestroika forces today, it will be worth very little. Democracy mustn't disgrace itself.

Afanasyev: Yes, no matter how much we say about the unity of democratic forces, it will all be meaningless if, for example, we start the winter without proper heating and fuel supplies. A talk like this becomes pointless then.

Rail Workers Union Opens 25th Congress 20 Sep

PM2109155590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Sep 90

[Report by A. Kozhukhova; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] The extraordinary 25th Railroad and Transport Construction Workers Union Congress opened today in Moscow.

[Kozhukhova] The mood of the delegates who have come here from various parts of the country is businesslike, energetic, and determined. Each delegate has come with orders and instructions from his labor collective, primarily for the material-technical base to be strengthened, working conditions improved, wages increased, and ordinary workers given social protection. The special features of the sector's transition to market relations at the crucial stage are to be discussed. The trade union is currently experiencing a crisis of confidence and,

during its three days' work, the congress must elaborate fundamental concrete principles for its activity and fundamentally revise many positions in view of the fact that working people's interests are the paramount task.

[I.A. Shinkevich, chairman of the Union Central Committee] I think that our trade union is in a particularly complex situation. Railroad transport is operating under very difficult conditions. For a number of years the government has not fulfilled its obligations; it has not funded the development of railroad transport, and the state of its material and technical base, working conditions, people's lives, and the level of wages are very low. For that reason our trade union must also review its work considerably in order to drastically change things in the sector and stop its slide into crisis. We must discuss a number of very important questions. First, we must adopt decisions that ensure the trade union's independent action, independent of economic, political, and state structures.

We are thinking very seriously about revising our staff and the main organizational principles, democratizing all internal union life, and adopting a more serious approach to democratizing the formation of the trade union's organs, along with a number of other questions.

Sends Appeal to Supreme Soviet

PM2609135190 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by T. Arzanova: "Stop, Locomotive.... If Railroad Workers' Ultimatum Is Not Accepted, We Will All Be Pedestrians"]

[Text] Delegates to the Extraordinary 25th Congress of the Rail Transport and Transport Construction Workers Union have adopted a statement addressed to the USSR Supreme Soviet abolishing the disciplinary regulations governing rail transport workers and granting railroad workers the right to strike.

Thus another "sledgehammer" used for years to keep workers in the sector docile has been abolished. These workers have been put in a difficult position owing to the increasing lack of railcars, locomotives, ties, and rails, and to the deterioration in their social conditions. All this has gotten too much for them.

"We appealed to the USSR Supreme Soviet, which indicated that it would take two days to ratify the congress decisions," Viktor Luchenetskiy, traffic controller with the Yaroslavl Department of the Northern Railroad, said. "If it fails to do so, we will set up a standing committee which will assume the right, affirming it at the congress, to control the situation and to take the most resolute measures, up to and including announcing a strike."

The congress delegates understand the full responsibility of this kind of statement, but consider it to be the only chance to draw the government's attention to the needs of a laggard sector which at the same time quite literally constitutes the country's arteries.

Miners' Committee Calls for New Trade Union

PM2409091590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 19 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by A. Kalinin: "Trade Unions? That's Politics—Miners' Leaders Think"]

[Text] An appeal by members of the organizing committee to prepare for the second miners' congress has been distributed at the country's mines.

The socioeconomic and sociopolitical situation is deteriorating with every passing month, it says. Neither the legislature nor the executive is capable of imposing elementary order in the country.

In this situation working people, who share all society's fate, must become even more cohesive and define their attitude to all the processes that are taking place, the organizing committee members think. They can form their will and their position only in their biggest mass organization—the trade unions. But not in the departmental trade unions, which today ape the system of administrative edict sectorial management whereby grass-roots interests cannot force their way up and be integrated into trade union policy.

New trade unions are needed—a social organization that is autonomous and independent of departmental and party influence and that will assume one of the most important social tasks: to express, realize, and, if necessary, defend workers' interests.

What sort of new trade union does the current organizing committee envisage? A sectorial union, as before, but one enabling various social and professional groups to unite within it in autonomous unions—workers, engineers, employees, etc. The association (federation) of miners is open to members of any party, the appeal stresses, but in current conditions the trade union leadership must not be members of any party. At the same time this does not mean that the trade union is a depoliticized organization. On the contrary, it forms its attitude to what is taking place and, on that basis, supports or does not support the policy being carried out.

The organizing committee members called upon miners to begin electing delegates to their second congress, which will meet in Donetsk at the end of October and discuss and adopt the new trade union's rules.

CPSU Report on Kirov's Death 'Falsified'

LD2609121490 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] The conclusions of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo commission set up in 1960 to investigate the circumstances of the murder of Sergey Kirov, who was regarded as Stalin's successor, were falsified.

This was announced by Olga Shatunovskaya, a member of the commission and veteran CPSU member [name and title as heard]. She made this announcement after reports appeared in the Soviet press alleging that the commission concluded that Stalin was not implicated in getting rid of his rival.

Shatunovskaya said the forgery of the documents assembled by the commission was made on the instructions of Stalinists immediately around Nikita Khrushchev.

The commission actually established that Kirov's murder in 1934 was organized by the People's Commissariat of Internal Affairs on Stalin's direct instructions.

Government Adopts Resolution on AIDS

LD2609224590 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—The USSR Council of Ministers has adopted a resolution "on measures to ensure social protection of persons infected with the Human Immune Deficiency Virus (HIV) or acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) patients".

It was decided, in particular, to establish a state allowance in an amount of minimum wage for children under 16 who are HIV-infected or ill with AIDS.

The resolution envisages the maintenance of one of the parent's uninterrupted length of service in the event of the breaking off of the labour contract by him or her in view of the need to look after a child infected with HIV or ill with AIDS, in order to estimate an allowance for temporary disability, provided he or she gets a job before the child is 16.

The USSR State Committee for Public Education jointly with the governments of the union and autonomous republics and the USSR Health Ministry has been instructed to organise education for children and adolescents who are in clinics, rehabilitation centres or at home, according to special programmes of the secondary general educational or vocational school course.

The Soviet Health Ministry has been directed to determine a procedure for a free provision of medicines for the treatment of HIV-infected persons or AIDS patients in outpatient department conditions.

The resolution establishes that a procedure to compensate expenses connected with a free passage of the above-mentioned people to the place of medical treatment and back shall be determined by the governments of union and autonomous republics.

It is also recommended that these authorities, as well as the executive committees of local councils of people's deputies and trade union agencies take additional measures within their competence and with due regard for regional peculiarities, to provide social assitance to HIV-infected persons or AIDS patients.

The USSR Ministry of Finance is instructed together with the Soviet Health Ministry and the all-Union Central Council of Soviet Trade Unions to draw up proposals concerning a compulsory state insurance of health workers who run the risk of being infected with HIV, and to submit them to the USSR Council of Ministers.

BAM Journalists Resign En Masse From Party

PM2609134590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Sep 90 p 1

[Report by V. Belyy: "BAM Bids Farewell to Party"]

[Text] Amur Oblast—The BAM [Baykal-Amur Railroad] newspaper's party organization has ceased to exist. All its members (and they included GUDOK's own correspondent T. Andreyeva), with the exception of the editor, have applied to leave the CPSU.

Previously the party had demanded that they remain faithful proponents of its ideas. But now, on the threshold of the market, it has essentially left editorial office collectives to the mercy of fate. The surge in the price of paper, transportation, and printing services has come as a particular blow to smaller-circulation publications. And BAM is a classic example of that.

Obituary of Ex-Counterintelligence Chief Carried

PM2509160390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Sep 90 First Edition p 4

[Obituary of Colonel General Ivan Alekseyevich Markelov]

[Excerpts] Colonel General Ivan Alekseyevich Markelov, former deputy chairman of the USSR KGB and chief of a Main Directorate, died 18 September 1990 at the age of 73. [passage omitted]

In the postwar years I.A. Markelov worked in the central apparatus and headed a number of KGB territorial organs. For several years he was one of the leaders of KGB external intelligence, and was subsequently appointed chief of the Soviet Counterintelligence Main Directorate. [passage omitted]

V.A. Kryuchkov, G.Ye. Ageyev, F.D. Bobkov, V.F. Grushko, A.A. Denisov, I.Ya. Kalinichenko, V.P. Pirozhkov, V.A. Ponomarev, L.V. Shebarshin, N.M. Golushko, Ye.F. Ivanov, A.A. Kurkov, Yu.S. Plekhanov, V.M. Prilukov, N.A. Savenkov, V.S. Sergeyev, Yu.V. Storozhev, N.I. Nazarov, and other comrades.

Economic

Academicians View Draft on Market Transition

Aganbegyan Interviewed

904A0608A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 Sep 90 p 2

[Report on interview with Academician A. Aganbegyan by SELSKAYA ZHIZN Kremlin correspondent Irina Konovalova; place and date not given: "The Third Version"]

[Text] **The USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing discussion of the draft transition to the market. There were initially two versions—that of the government and the one devised by a group of scientists headed by Academician S. Shatalin. As a result of collation and a concordance of efforts a joint document appeared which included the bulk of the Shatalin concept, all that was valuable from the government program, and many proposals received through independent initiative. The draft was prepared at the behest of the country's president by Academician A. Aganbegyan. We offer our readers an interview with him.**

[Konovalova] Abel Gezevich, people are arguing about the concepts which have been presented. But there is rare unity of opinion on one point: In all versions the transition to the market of the agrarian sector has been elaborated extremely inadequately. The authors were not named, but it is known that none of the groups of experts incorporated agrarian specialists. To be honest, I have not even managed to find a senior official who will comment on the agrarian chapters of the documents. What does this mean: The country is virtually on the brink of famine, and we are still only at the point of having to prove that attention needs to be paid to agriculture?

[Aganbegyan] Indeed, if we did not know of the calamitous position of this sector of the economy it might be thought that everything was in order here or that this was the most negligible part of our economy. Meanwhile I am sure that perestroyka should have begun with the countryside five years ago. Not at random, however, but by formulating a new agrarian policy inasmuch as the food program had failed and nothing else had appeared in its place.

Concerning the government program. It was said that it had been worked up in more detail. Truly, it was evenly written, contained many figures, had good things to say about the sovereignty of the republics, and painted a picture of the present state of the sector. But what then? Then, for example, it proposed once again a system of state purchases—the government contract. That is, administrative oppression, a product monopoly, and a management monopoly continue. After all, all the administrative bodies over the kolkhozes and sovkhozes [collective and state farms] are preserved.

[Konovalova] But in the Shatalin draft also demonopolization is only proclaimed. And in the agrarian section it is altogether more reminiscent of a political manifesto and provides the direction of movement and the ultimate goal—the market—but no mechanisms?

[Aganbegyan] On the one hand this is a serious shortcoming, which has been mentioned repeatedly. But there is also another aspect. Ours is a vast, multinational country, and each republic has its own conditions, traditions, and possibilities for pursuing agriculture. Would it have been right to have given everyone a uniform prescription and strict plan? I believe that the agrarian sector should be as decentralized as possible. The Baltic, where the noncommunal system has historical roots and could produce tremendous results very quickly, is one thing. Russia, which is accustomed to living as a commune, is another. Yet another is Uzbekistan with its farming through irrigation. East Kazakhstan is utterly dissimilar to South Kazakhstan, and Tyumen, to the Ukraine. Attempting once again to command everyone from the center would mean making another mistake. And what should really be done everywhere is to separate economic from state activity. Government authorities are not responsible for expenditure and revenue, and the government official is not dependent on the results of the economic activity of the kolkhoz or sovkhoz and obtains his wages "from another pocket," and for this reason he has no right to command enterprises. All that can be should be put on a commercial basis, removed from subordination to the apparatus and made subordinate to common sense. Of course, there is the sphere of culture, education, health care, and basic research—these are beyond commercialization, but we are not talking about these.

Control functions, education, consultations, subsidies, and support for the agrarian sector should be reserved to the state. But there should be a qualitative change in all this also. With us the kolkhozes receive subsidies, but bear no responsibility. They are assigned a plan and prices from above, and the monopoly procurement agent and monopoly supplier looms over them. And the result? No one is responsible for anything, and as a result money is frittered away. We know, however, that in many oblasts meat subsidies for the kolkhozes and sovkhozes are higher than the market prices by such an amount that were we altogether simply to switch to market prices, there would be a tremendous savings of resources. I am not fond of strong language, but it would seem that, acting from its own interests, a group has closed ranks and is literally banging its head against a brick wall: Now it shouts that the town owes the country, so we should raise purchase prices; then it begins to wind up the spring in the opposite direction—toward an increase in the cost of equipment.... This is called a leveling of interests? Excuse me, no country has such a thing. And from the viewpoint of the economy, it is simply incompetent.

[Konovalova] For competent decisions to be made, people who think at the appropriate level are needed. But with us, as you know, agrarian thought has for

dozens of years been kept down, and there are now no new names, no fresh ideas, no original approaches. And one further piece of confirmation: I heard that you reworked over 100 enterprising studies and proposals when formulating the joint program of transition to the market—did you come across anything of interest pertaining to the countryside?

[Aganbegyan] No, there was no agrarian reform. And not by accident, I believe. People are tired of submitting proposals which time after time go unclaimed, which are not understood, and which are given a hostile reception. In agriculture bureaucratic rule has reached an absolute, and volitional methods substitute for everything.

I recall that at the start of the 1980's, Academician T. Zaslavskaya and I, visiting a kolkhoz in Altay Kray, observed the following scene: A secretary of the rayon party committee was telephoning the kolkhoz chairman and ordering him to have manure carted out to the fields. The latter was refusing, the weather did not allow it, he said, I would be ruining the equipment, and there are plenty of other things to do, and we can, after all, wait, and then we will have a better view of the situation. No, the secretary's telephone call was not a joke and not a piece of advice, it was a demand....

And a few days ago a similar situation, as they say. I had arrived for the first conciliation meeting with leaders of the government. The ministers spoke: Some said what steps they deemed it possible to take toward a rapprochement. One, for example, said that, of the 18 points which had been worked up, a compromise version could be found on 16, another gave his positions and his concessions. We reached agrarian issues. It should be said that I had submitted alternative, very modest, and toned-down proposals for discussion. And I was absolutely taken aback by the abrupt and categorical reaction of V. Nikitin. He rejected out of hand all that had been proposed, without any arguments, and so unceremoniously that I was simply stunned. The draft was absolutely useless, he said, and the government stuck to its guns: No less than 70 percent—government contract, and prices should be regulated in a totally centralized manner, the family farms are totally unnecessary.... It remains to wonder that, under such a press, our agriculture is still in a state of stagnation and not hurtling swiftly toward the abyss.

The draft of the Shatalin group is profitably distinguished merely by the fact that it proposes lifting this oppression and democratizing and demonopolizing the agrarian sector. There can be no market under monopolism.

The land act passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet is not being realized. Yet this law, although it rejected private property, allows certain flexible options: A long-term lease with inheritance transfers, and a right of mortgage (that is, you would have the right to obtain credit on the basis of the land) could be based on this; the prospect of rural banks is emerging, the extension of credit on a commercial basis is beginning.... What, then, are the sensible proposals? They are well known: creating equal economic conditions for different proprietors. Let people, if they want, remain on the kolkhozes and sovkhozes—would that they will! But on the basis of economic expediency and a voluntary approach. And if some people intend to test their individual capabilities and be responsible for managing their farm personally, very good.

However, the question once again boils down to the land act—it is not operating. A good idea—pluralism of land relations, the existence of various production formations—is coming up against reality. After all, 98 percent of the land is reserved to the kolkhozes and sovkhozes on monopoly, nonchargeable, and indefinite tenure. It is frequently used inadequately, but you cannot take it and purchase or lease it on a legal basis. And it is not fortuitous, therefore, that the practicable proposals received from agrarian specialists, V. Tikhonov and A. Yemelyanov, for example, and realized in the "500 Days" program have amounted to the need for land reform. That this is merely cited in the draft, but that a detailed study is lacking, is another matter.

[Konovalova] It is this that is shocking to many people. People are portraying matters such that a new reallotment, bloodshed and fratricide, virtually, is beginning—we have heard plenty about how this was the case in 1917....

[Aganbegyan] I am sure that this apportionment will be prepared in detail very soon. However, the fears are not groundless. It will not, I think, come to bloodshed, but we should not expect the administrative-command system to give up its positions without a fight.

[Konovalova] Concerning decentralization. How is this demand combined with the fact that the draft of transition to the market is proceeding by the customary channel—from the top down, from the center—to the republics? Will there not be emotional, psychological rejection here?

[Aganbegyan] I constantly hear this question in different versions for it really is very painful and simultaneously fundamental. I know for a fact that at all stages of the work of the Shatalin group there was active consultation with representatives of the republics on matters of mutual interest. And it is not of decisive significance whether these were the leaders or their aides—they were authorized—and they were very businesslike and optimistic about the draft. I am convinced that common sense will prevail and that the joint draft will be approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet and will in 500 days have been realized.

[Konovalova] I would like to believe so....

Abalkin Advocates Caution

PM2709094390 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by N. Garifullina, on 19 September; place not given: "A Choice Has To Be Made"—first two paragraphs are SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] The debate at the USSR Supreme Soviet on the transition to a market economy seems to have reached "boiling point." What decision will the people's deputies adopt, and which path will the country take? Millions of people await the answer with anxiety and hope.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA recently familiarized readers with the Shatalin-Yavlinskiy program. And today one of the authors of the government program—Academician L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers—shares his thoughts. The conversation with him took place 19 September.

[Garifullina] Leonid Ivanovich, on addressing the USSR Supreme Soviet session, you made principled comments on the presidential program for the transition to a market economy. You said at that time that this was not only your personal opinion—it was supported by members of the USSR Government. Could you speak about this in greater detail?

[Abalkin] I was speaking not of details—there are very many of them—but of three fundamental, conceptual disagreements which cannot be eliminated by the method of reaching agreement. They demand a choice. Here it is not a matter of seeking a compromise but of the need to make a political decision.

The first comment concerns the choice of the option for moving toward the market. We all reached the conclusion—and I believe that this is proved convincingly by historical experience and science—that without the market it is impossible to extricate the country from the crisis and to create an efficient, flexible economy that is receptive to scientific and technical progress and geared to the consumer. But the transition to the market certainly does not mean abandoning socialism. On the contrary, it means impregnating socialism with new qualities and emancipating its potential—economic, social, and spiritual. However, it is very difficult to combine the market with the model of socialism which has evolved in our country.

How are we to move toward the market? The presidential program proposes an accelerated transition. It is also called "shock therapy," but I do not think these are the right words. An accelerated, speeded-up transition is more accurate. But we believe that such an option is unacceptable for the country. We favor the radical-moderate option, which combines decisive changes with caution, consideration, and strict calculation. You can say as much as you like that we are too cautious, but this is not a character trait of those who drew it up but a position based on a sober analysis and prognosis.

What is at the basis of this approach? The crisis in the economy is developing and deepening. This is a reality. The structure of the economy has evolved over decades, it is cumbersome, with a huge proportion of extracting sectors and with monopolized production structures. It is unrealistic to restructure everything in weeks and months or, maybe, even over several years.

Further, considerable sections of the population are not ready to work under the new conditions. It is possible to speak about stereotypes of thinking and a backward mentality—but, once again, these are realities. It is necessary also to take account of the political instability in society, the increased activities of certain forces, and the growth of national separatism. All this leads to the conclusion that, if we go too hastily, disregarding the possible consequences, then this could not only result in a greater crisis in the economy but also discourage us from tackling the reform at some time in the very near future.

The next difference concerns the view of the fate of the Union. Yes, of course, the deformations which have accumulated in interethnic relations over the decades and the infringement of the rights of nations, ethnic groups, republics, and regions are realities which have been perpetrated, but it is necessary to overcome them and preserve the union state. It is a subject in international law, a great power, a permanent member of the UN Security Council, a power which has signed many postwar agreements. And, accordingly, it is a state which must possess all the necessary attributes in the economic sphere too, have a unified border, a unified custom house and territory, and a unified monetary system, and have at its disposal the USSR Central State Bank fulfilling functions approximating to those fulfilled in similar states by the federal reserve system, as in the United States, or by the Deutsche Bundesbank in the FRG. Accordingly, not only does each republic possess sovereignty but the USSR also has its own sovereignty as a state. Yes, the powers and the borders of sovereignty are determined by treaty, but this is all to come and does not yet exist, and we are accustoming ourselves to living in a rule-of-law state and we respect and observe the laws. The constitutional norms of the Union extend throughout the territory. The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet has adopted a concept and a program which essentially proceeds from recognition of the elimination of the USSR as a state. This Union is also supplanted by a union, but an economic one, by some international agreement which is said even to be close to the EC. It is possible to find a more accurate definition—the British Commonwealth of Nations, for example, or maybe an even more accurate one: the old CEMA with all its flaws.

As regards the new Union Treaty, in my view subsequent political agreements will merely make the economic

union official, and the state's disintegration will be a fait accompli. And it is proposed to do this without broad discussion, in secret....

[Garifullina] Maybe this is why there is such haste?...

[Abalkin] The haste is understandable too. The thing is that at first the "500 days" program contained a kind of mystery effect. You understand, they suggest to people: There is some miraculous means, and our people believe in miracles or, at least, they want to believe that there is a painless path, without sacrifices and upheavals, without a drop in living standards, without a rise in prices....

You might have noticed that in such crisis situations there begins a mass belief in aliens, UFO's, extrasensory perception, and much else. This is a social phenomenon, you know. I spoke of this many years ago. This situation began to be manifested clearly in the late seventies and early eighties. Way back then I used to appear and say how social collisions give rise to such a belief. And so the "500 days" program also contained a kind of mystery effect. No one had yet seen it, but the idea of its miracle-working properties was being purposefully and systematically inculcated in the mass consciousness.

But when the program is placed on the table, when everyone can read it, perceive some contradictions and shortcomings, or, at any rate, take a conscious and critical approach to its calculations and authenticity, the mystery effect vanishes. But the time which elapses before the decision is adopted is destructive. And so people want to adopt the program as quickly as possible, without professional investigation and analysis, on trust alone. "Let's believe! Such names are there, such humane aims are proclaimed. Let's adopt it, and then we can see. We will amend it, finish it off, correct it, elaborate it. Why bother with trifles now?!..."

[Garifullina] And, at the same time, begin introducing this program super-promptly, as early as 1 October?...

[Abalkin] There is another nuance here. Yes, time is altogether getting short. The government program is also short of time, and we must not delay for long. The first of October marks the start of the fourth quarter—we too emphasize this in our programs. Only there this date is a zero option—there has been no history, and nothing at all has happened before 1 October. And yet there is history. The reform is already under way. The laws on ownership, land, and leasing have already been adopted, the tax system has been adopted, and the Law on the Population's Income Tax has been in effect since 1 July.

[Garifullina] Was all this the preparation?

[Abalkin] Yes, the preparation, but also the introduction of the reform. The resolution on joint-stock companies was adopted so as not to wait for any further legislative acts. The first companies have already been registered. Commercial banks, which are the second level of the banking system—there are already approximately 300 of them—are preparing the ground. The first trade exchanges have already been set up and are beginning to function. Life is on the move! The cooperative movement is developing too.

[Garifullina] That is, preparations were being made during all the years of perestroyka to introduce the program and make the transition to the market?

[Abalkin] Not all the years. I must be fair and admit that there was tardiness in implementing the economic reform and failures to meet deadlines, and it was introduced uncomprehensively. This happened particularly during 1987-1989—after the well-known decisions at the beginning of the reform. But if we speak of the new government, which has been working for just over one year, this work really has been carried out consistently throughout the year. And particularly intensively over the past eight months, since December, since the decisions of the Second Congress of People's Deputies which supported the measures proposed by the government and gave instructions to prepare the program.

Incidentally, it is important to point out that very frequently even respected people, highly respected people's deputies speak of the responsibility and the mistakes of the government over **five years**. But the government has been operating for **just one year**, just like all the new structures of power, starting with the Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet, which were elected only in March last year and began work in May. So it is incorrect and unforgivable—I repeat—for quite professional and competent people to muddle dates or to do this deliberately.

But you were right to remark that the preparation was made consistently and that the whole system certainly did not start from scratch. The laws which I mentioned have been adopted, and a new package of documents has been prepared and was submitted in August for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet. All this boils down to very responsibly taking a big radical step.

The weakness of uncoordinated actions has already been proved by our experience. This is inadmissible, and therefore many laws have already been adopted and normative acts are being prepared. I will begin with a simple matter. We have already adopted a decision to introduce new purchase prices. Peasants await new prices for milk, meat, cotton, sugar beets, sunflowers—the plan is built on them. This is a powerful incentive for any forms—peasant farms, collective farms, state farms—to begin functioning efficiently. For the price is, above all, an incentive for producers. If we introduce the pension law 1 January, we must have its financial base—new deductions for social insurance. The third thing is deductions from social insurance, and the pension law. If we introduce a new system of taxes on profits—we seem to have all agreed on this, and the law comes into force 1 January—it proposes a package for changing the system of prices. Without them it is impossible to introduce either taxes or new interest rates on

bank credits, which, incidentally, are included in all the programs. They are all bound up, and you cannot tear them apart. So it is unacceptable to try to tear up and dismember only a part of these measures, so as to cast doubt on the reality of social programs, of major financial and material support for the countryside and the agro-industrial sector by means of prices and special targeted investments of funds in the social restructuring of the countryside—the provision of gas supplies, road construction, the guaranteed supply of material and technical resources. It is hardly admissible to improve the economy at such a price. That is, this is either the consistent, logical implementation of the steps which have been begun or an attempt to cancel out everything that has been done and to begin afresh, having torn up these measures at the time of their introduction.

[Garifullina] How do you assess the reality of financial improvement in the alternative programs?

[Abalkin] I can state with absolute accuracy, on the basis of an analysis of the proffered materials, that the measures in the program under discussion for financial improvement over a short period—100 days—are unrealistic. They are not confirmed by calculations and cannot be implemented without an offensive upon the living standards of broad sections of the population and upon social programs. And if they are unrealistic, the guarantees which could restrain the sharp, rapid growth in prices that have been set free fall away. This means that it is quite likely that the inflation spiral will unwind and we will lose the advantages which improvement could produce.

Here, just as in the second point on the future structure of the USSR, it is necessary to choose. The way we see it and they—these approaches—are incompatible.

And society must make the choice. Precisely society. But the choice cannot and must not go through in some offices, without the people. We must determine which option we choose. I see how complex and responsible the task facing the Supreme Soviet is.... And yet I emphasize once again that it is a question of a choice, and this is not just a comparison of two alternative options. The choice of program is both a choice of destiny and an assumption of responsibility. Someone must answer for any option. Whoever submitted the program, voted for it, and assumed responsibility for its fulfillment must also answer before history, before the people's judgment.

If we speak of the government, it is prepared to answer only for the program which it elaborated and which it submitted repeatedly for discussion. It has been discussed three times in the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation, in addition to the Supreme Soviet. Of course, we can assume responsibility only under certain conditions, and we are ready to formulate them.

[Garifullina] What are these conditions?

[Abalkin] To be brief, they are strict observance of the adopted laws and the USSR Constitution. Rejection of any actions which violate the norms of life in a rule-of-law state. Observance of these laws at all levels and the restoration of law and order. Rejection of all destructive actions which represent nothing but playing with the people's destinies. Rejection of economic blockades of territories and mass strikes, for which the country's population has to pay all the same, and the opening of enterprises of priority importance for the national economy connected with the production of medicinal preparations and many other products. The declaration, if you like, of civilian peace and the conclusion of voluntary concord.

We are on the edge of an abyss. Any incautious step could topple us into it. We must appeal to the people's reason, to their consciousness—without this it is impossible to work. This is an appeal not only to the republics. It is an appeal to public movements and mass public actions. It is also an appeal to such a very mighty fourth element of power—the press and the mass media, which shape public opinion in the country. We must unite and understand what awaits the people. And not try to place personal, political, or scientific ambitions above the people's interests.

[Garifullina] Leonid Ivanovich, what key, fundamental differences are there between the programs in their approaches to privatization and the easing of state control?

[Abalkin] The most fundamental difference in this sphere concerns land. We are opposed to the sale of land and its transfer to private ownership. We recognize different forms: freedom of management and freedom to choose any forms of management. Peasants, rural workers, and city dwellers who want to use land will decide for themselves. Provision can be made for long-term leasing, leasing for an unlimited term, and the bequeathing of leased land, if ecological and other requirements are not violated in its use. The sale of land into private ownership contradicts the very logic of economic development. Incidentally, many experts with whom we have spoken, even Western ones, have warned us of the dangerous consequences of selling land. Yes, a person must feel confident and stable, and the bequeathing of land to children must be guaranteed, but the land is the common property of the people who inhabit the country, just as other natural resources are.

As for privatization.... Incidentally, this term is not quite accurate, and we do not use it. Reduction of state control is a more accurate yet also a more complex concept. I will cite the following example. In my view, the president has accomplished an act of colossal political strength—he has transferred to the ownership of the Academy of Sciences the property of institutes, laboratories, and scientific centers. It has ceased to be state property and is now the property of the Academy of Sciences. But is it really private property if all the installations, laboratories, space centers—just what does it not include!—if all

this is now at the disposal of the community of scientists? This is a totally different structure. There likewise exist multifarious forms of property of various types—cooperative, collective, joint-stock, and certain others which are not covered by the concept "private property." It is admissible and is dictated by its own logic when it is a question of a hairdressing salon, a gasoline pump, a bakery, or something similar. But, when reducing state control, it is necessary to ensure the primacy of labor collectives. Precisely these must own the means of production and dispose of the results of their labor. Both the master's mentality and high responsibility for the results of their labor will take shape precisely with the transfer of state property to them.

All forms must be combined and, when placed under equal conditions, by means of normal struggle and competition, prove their advantages and correspondingly occupy a greater or lesser proportion. I would say that there are no profound differences of principle here, because the question of exploitation has been removed both from the program submitted for discussion by the president and from ours. I would like only to point out that reducing state control is a lengthy process. A juridical change in the forms of ownership is an act of a moment, while a change in economic forms of relations requires considerably longer times. It is dangerous to rush things.

[Garifullina] Leonid Ivanovich, the program of the Union government is criticized primarily and chiefly for supposedly being based on a substantial rise in prices, and this has quite an impact on people who, on the whole, are not familiar with the program. Do the alternative programs intend to avoid an increase in prices?

[Abalkin] When the programs are being compared, it is natural that the supporters of both programs try to emphasize the weak aspects or to accentuate attention on them. I get the impression that this question is manifestly misrepresented and exaggerated. An attempt is being made to prove that all disagreements boil down only to this, and the myth that this is the chief difference is being stubbornly spread.

I am convinced that the creation of certain illusions is an attempt to evade the fundamental questions of which I spoke at the beginning—the fate of the Union, an accelerated transition, or a cautious, considered movement toward the market. These questions take a back seat, as it were, and red rags are pulled out to tease public opinion.

The difference lies elsewhere. Prices will rise in all instances—this is a law of the market, a law of economics. If prices do not rise, speculation will increase, and no methods, including administrative measures, can beat speculation if such a system of price formation exists. It is fertile ground for speculation. Prices always gravitate toward their conventional, natural level. If this is not done legally, it happens illegally on the black market.

The difference is this. By regularizing prices, which inevitably follows from the overall logic of deductions for social insurance, and raising the prices of oil and coal, without which we cannot finance the development of basic sectors of the economy—this all has a chain-reaction effect—first, we fully compensate the population for the price increase implemented by the state. One for one. Ruble for ruble. We do not want to make a single kopek out of this. And, second, we then place this sum of prices under the state's control.

This is the kind of magnitude of the sums involved so that you can get a feel of the logic. The volume of commodity turnover in our country is roughly 400 billion rubles [R]—these are annual sales. The increase in prices which we envisage amounts to R135 billion—approximately one-third of the total volume—and one-third goes to compensate the population, ruble for ruble, as I have already said. The state imposes a certain limit on all these prices, which are basic for the population—they include foodstuffs, clothes, footwear, and cultural and domestic goods. It places these prices under its control. Some 30 percent of prices are under the control of the Union government, 40 percent are given over to the republics, and approximately 30 percent are given up to contract prices and free price formation. After increasing expenditure and then compensating the population for it, we guarantee the continued production and sales of products to the population at firm prices.

A different option has been chosen in the program submitted by the president. It states that prices will not be raised formally or administratively by the government but will change under the influence of supply and demand, i.e. market conditions. It provides for limits on certain commodities and names a list of 150 commodities. They do not include bread, it is said, except for just two kinds, while the rest are free. You do not particularly have to be a seer to understand that there will not be bread for 13 kopeks or "Orel" bread, but there will be all the rest, only more expensive, and no one will receive compensation for that. There will be indexation, for, incidentally, our programs coincide with regard to indexation. But if financial improvement, of which I have spoken, is unrealistic, prices will start to creep up, and it will be hard to control their growth. And, according to our estimates, it will be considerably higher than forecast. True, there appear to be no guilty parties here. Well, really, who is guilty? Prices have risen by themselves. The market! But this does not make things any easier for people. Of course, if you draw a veil over this and do not focus attention on it, then the state appears to remain aloof here.

[Garifullina] Paying tribute to the government program, a deputy said that it candidly shows the ravines, but there are also catwalks by means of which it is possible to extricate oneself from the ravines. Which of these "catwalks" strikes you personally as strongest?

[Abalkin] The extensive program of measures for financial improvement. The buildup of output through conversion, particularly of complex domestic equipment, which we want to throw onto the market in order to tie up money savings; the reduction of actual spending on defense, on production, of investments, and on aid to foreign states.

We are not abandoning the realization of the planned social programs, and so we are not reckoning on carrying out the period of financial improvement in 100 days, and it will be doing well if it takes only 18 months. This coincides with the general logic of the moderate radical option: to improve things, but as painlessly as possible. To improve things, but without treading on social programs.

There are the following niceties. People say: "We will sell off state property, and so we will both achieve financial improvement and stabilize the market." But we have made a very professional analysis—involving excellent specialists—of the structure of savings. A person holds money but cannot today buy a television set, a refrigerator, a washing machine, a suite of furniture, or a set of kitchen utensils. He has put the money by and is waiting. So if you sell a hairdressing salon, a laundry, or a poncho that was military property, someone will buy and some money will be drawn off, but the guy who put it by for a television set or a refrigerator will not buy shares. All the same, this money will remain in the consumer market as pressing demand, and if we do not counter it with appropriate measures, it will not be reabsorbed. But even if people buy some property, maybe this will reduce the sum of the investments that we now have, but it will not produce a great improvement and might even worsen the financial situation, because these are credit resources, the population's savings. All the same, this whole mass that has been put by will await its turn.

[Garifullina] How does the government intend to protect us under market conditions?

[Abalkin] We are making a very broad study of guarantees and measures of social protection, and we include such questions of social protection as ensuring employment, creating jobs and alternative forms of employment—which is very important under conditions of coming unemployment—retraining worker cadres.... The population's ecological protection also comes under the social block. Everything is written down in detail. And, most importantly, we do not recognize the admissibility of curtailing social programs that have already been adopted.

[Garifullina] Leonid Ivanovich, do you consider it possible to adopt without discussion by the entire people a program which will abruptly change the political and economic situation in the country? And, incidentally, what is your attitude to the people's deputies' proposal to hold a referendum?

[Abalkin] A proposal to hold a referendum was advanced by the government back in May, when cardinal changes in the system of price formation were being discussed, and we went openly, although people said to us—you are committing suicide and you will not get support or trust. But we replied that we wanted to play an honest game and so were ready to hold a referendum. But the proposal was not adopted. These are not such simple questions. If, let us say, the government program is put to a nationwide referendum and if we receive support in that, then the government gets independence from the Supreme Soviet and even from the congress and we receive the highest mandate of confidence from the people and become independent in implementing economic policy. Whoever has obtained the people's approval—and a referendum is the highest expression of the people's will—possesses such a right. However, far from everyone was prepared to risk the government's getting the opportunity. The overall distribution of sociopolitical forces and the struggle against the government had an influence.

A referendum demands preciseness, clarity, and simplicity. A 180-page program cannot be submitted for discussion. And how to vote? I agree with this. Two questions are ready for a referendum. The president himself spoke of one of them in his speech in the Supreme Soviet. This is the question of private ownership of land, a most pointed question demanding a clear answer—for or against.

And the second question for a referendum, of which I spoke in my speech, is the question of the future state structure of the USSR. For or against preserving the USSR as a federative state.

It is clear, simple, and obvious. And the people must make their choice unequivocally. And then, having received the people's answer, it is necessary to stop all political games, for then no one has the right to dispute the choice made by the people. At least not for quite a while, within the life of a generation.

Matters really have now reached the extreme exacerbation of the situation, although perhaps I have not put it accurately—things probably have not reached that point. People sometimes say: Things could not be worse. Excuse me, but if we do not take decisive measures, do not instill order, and do not achieve concord in society, life as it is today will seem like paradise.

What can await us if we do not venture upon considered, well thought-out steps and do not achieve concord? The prognosis is quite clear: The first crisis will break with the onset of winter and will escalate into a very strong public protest and disobedience. If we still manage somehow to get through the winter, then a general collapse of economic ties will, I believe, ensue toward spring—by February-March. This will be the most terrible political and economic crisis in the country, and it is already hard to predict the further consequences.

Today we have not yet reached the furthest line but are standing before it, and God forbid that we cross it, for then it will be too late to hold a referendum and then

some other force must come and say: "Enough! Let us instill order." What is needed to prevent that happening is the maximum concord, awareness of our responsibility for the peoples' destinies, and readiness to assume it. Then an opportunity will emerge to extricate the country from the crisis and from the impending threat of chaos.

[Garifullina] Leonid Ivanovich, does it not seem to you that the following problem is one of the causes of instability in the country—local Soviets and the center syndrome?

[Abalkin] Alas, it does exist. What is the matter here? A real demarcation of powers has occurred. A huge number of spheres of the national economy—the agro-industrial complex with all its sectors, housing and municipal services, and construction—have been transferred to the jurisdiction of local soviets in the republics. Some of them recently, but others long ago, like the bread-baking industry, for example. But the center syndrome does exist: "Bus services in our city are bad. Which way is Ryzhkov's government looking?" A rough formula. This has taken root and become the object of speculation.

People who either do not possess management skills or are unable to resolve specific questions, who frequently arrived in the soviets riding on a wave of rally emotions and of attempts at destructive criticism of absolutely everything, are now trying to shirk responsibility. The operation of city transport and municipal services, preparations for winter, fruit and vegetable supplies to the city, the organization of the trade in bread, etc. are the direct, full, and exclusive province and responsibility of local organs of power. It is essential to reject the center syndrome. Given your own irresponsibility and inability to cope with things, you must not shift the pointer of responsibility to those who have no bearing on local affairs. This gives rise to a general atmosphere of nervousness and political instability.

[Garifullina] How do you forecast the development of events if one program or the other is adopted?

[Abalkin] First, if the government's program is adopted and, second, if terms on which the government will assume responsibility are accepted, a slow process of improvement awaits us. A process extending over 18-24 months. There will be gradual stabilization and the gradual resolution of tasks connected with saturating the consumer market. This will not happen at once with regard to large goods. There will begin—although also, maybe, not in an accelerated version—an upsurge of labor activeness, a new motivation mechanism will take shape, a thrifty attitude toward labor, property, and national assets will be revived, ecological crises will gradually be resolved, and there will be an equally slow and gradual restoration of the population's confidence in the ability of the country's leadership to emerge from the crisis. The situation will be rough and even quite prone to zigzags, and the possibility of conflicts is not excluded. A problem-free future hardly awaits us, but, on the other hand, there will be gradual improvement.

If we take the "500 days" program in its initial form, I do not believe in it. I consider it unrealistic and not feasible at the initial stage, and all the rest will follow from this. If, as is proposed, all existing structures of management are destroyed without delay, ministries are eliminated without delay, and prices are set free, then it is possible to expect a collapse with the inevitable destruction of economic ties between regions and related enterprises. In many cases production will be paralyzed no later than the spring and, most likely, sooner—and there will be a considerable slump in production. The mothballing of construction projects will cause mass unemployment. No protective mechanisms will be able to compensate for the splurge in prices. Not only an economic but also a political crisis will develop and could either take the long drawn-out line toward still greater chaos and collapse or result in the removal from the political arena of the forces which authored this program and in the arrival of some new authoritative political structures.

I would not like to meet with you in six months' time and say: See, I told you so. I do not want that to happen. But this is only possible if an attempt is not made to implement it. And if it is...—no, I do not want that! You must not win bets at the cost of the people's sacrifices.

But I am obliged to see this result as a citizen and a scientist and to struggle against this with all my might, which is what I am doing. So far, it is true, without any particular success.

[Garifullina] Leonid Ivanovich, does the debate in parliament reassure you, and how do you assess it in general?

[Abalkin] Of course, the debate does not satisfy me very much. I observe this process at close quarters, and I feel that deputies are under quite tough pressure both from the drafters of the programs and from the press, which has expressed its opinion without even reading them. And pressure resulting from the authority of Russia: "Look, they have adopted a program, so what about us?" And yet they voted without reading the second program at all. It was clear to them—without reading it!—that it was bad! Nonetheless, a deputy must demand respect for himself and only vote when everything is clear to him, when he has made the choice himself, not under pressure....

Moscow Mayor Interviewed on Economic Reforms

AU2409102490 Vienna PROFIL in German 24 Sep 90 p 55

[Interview with Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov by Michael Siegert in Vienna; date not given: "Remove the CPSU"]

[Text] [Siegert] Mr. Popov, a few days ago in Moscow you called for the resignation of Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov. President Gorbachev hinted that he does not want to dismiss Ryzhkov. Do you think that Ryzhkov will torpedo the realization of the Shatalin plan?

[Popov] Of course, he will. He presented a plan that is incompatible with the Shatalin plan. Thus, he must prove now that the Shatalin plan that has been adopted does not work. However, this is not the only aspect. The Ryzhkov government is the last remnant of the old system. The CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo shaped this government when they were still powerful. It is oriented toward the military-industrial complex. It is characterized by a centralist structure, it is against the separation of powers, and does not want to transfer rights to the republics. This is not compatible with Gorbachev's plan.

[Siegert] What would you suggest?

[Popov] A few years ago, Andrey Sakharov and the democratic reformers claimed that the system is not reformable as long as the CPSU remains in power. Since that time, the situation has deteriorated, and it has become clear that the old system no longer works. The CPSU must be removed from power. If Gorbachev does not get rid of the conservative forces, he will torpedo his own plan. The problem is not that he does not understand things, but he is still under the influence of the conservatives.

[Siegert] What will happen once they are removed?

[Popov] Economic restructuring should be accompanied by political restructuring. We need a new government with new ideas. Apart from the president, there is practically nobody with executive powers in the country. This is the greatest danger at the moment.

[Siegert] Who is ruling currently? The mafia?

[Popov] A general lack of understanding prevails at the moment. The mafia certainly has its share in this.

[Siegert] What about the mafia in Moscow?

[Popov] So far, the mafia has had no problems with us.

[Siegert] When you assumed office one year ago, you claimed that you would lease thousands of shops and that the shops would soon be full of goods. However, the shops are emptier than ever before. Have you failed?

[Popov] I never promised full shelves in the shops. I only promised that I would lease the shops. This will soon be tackled. The first thing that we will privatize are apartments. Then we will introduce private ownership of small enterprises, shops, repair shops, and craftsmen's establishments.

[Siegert] Can you explain the following paradox: Everybody in the Soviet Union is talking about the market, but exactly the opposite is happening: People are avoiding money and returning to a barter economy: Towns and districts trade coal against meat, cereals against textiles, etc. The workers are being supplied through the enterprises and not the shops.

[Popov] You are right. Two or three years ago it would still have been possible to fully introduce the market economy. However, we failed to do that. Now this is no longer possible because our economic situation is so bad. We must organize part of the supply of consumer goods on the basis of fixed prices in order to ensure a subsistence level for the people. The rest of the economy should be liberalized and function according to market-oriented and competitive principles.

Agricultural

'Emergency Measures' Adopted To Save Harvest

LD2609190590 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The Soviet Government today adopted a resolution on urgent measures to complete the harvesting and increase the purchases of grain, vegetable crops and potatoes.

The resolution points out that the harvest situation has aggravated in many areas of the country. As a result of unfavourable weather conditions, poor organisation in several places, the slackening of discipline and the lack of coordination in actions by municipal and rural governing and management bodies, a considerable part of the grown crops may remain unpicked.

Work to gather potatoes and vegetables, place them in storage silos and take them to major industrial centres, especially Moscow and Leningrad, is proceeding at a slow pace.

Separate collective and state farms, which have real capacities to increase the sale of grain, do not deliver contracted supplies to state buyers. The deficiency in grain supplies complicates the formation of the all-union and republican stocks of grain and may generate serious difficulties in the supply of population with bread and failure to produce the planned volumes of mixed feed for stock-breeding.

Considering the situation that has formed in the harvesting and procurement of crops as absolutely inadmissible, the Soviet Government proposed that the governments of the union and autonomous republics and also local authorities take emergency measures to salvage the harvest.

Virgin Land Oblasts Declare Harvest Emergency

PM2509130390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Oleg Stefashin report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Emergency Situation in the Harvest"]

[Text] Kazakhstan—The critical situation which has arisen in the harvest has forced the leadership of a number of virgin land oblasts to introduce a state of emergency on their territories.

Few would think to condemn the local authorities' actions, even though the measures that they are taking are often quite draconian in character. The majority understand that the crop, the like of which the virgin lands have never seen, is dying in the fields. The harvest is being seriously complicated by the shortage of transport, spares, and of course, manpower.

In Dzhezkazgan Oblast, for example, only one-half of the grain crop has been harvested to date. But even the grain which has already been threshed is too much for many farms to send to the grain reception centers—there are no vehicles. Alarmed at this situation, the oblast soviet executive committee has declared a state of emergency which will last until the end of September. By a special decision virtually all the transport at the majority of enterprises is being "requisitioned" and teams of drivers are being mobilized.

In Kustanay Oblast, where a state of emergency was declared somewhat earlier, new and more rigorous measures have gone into effect. Organizations and institutions in the city not engaged in the material production sector have stopped work. All the workers have been sent to the harvest. Unprecedented shift norms have been introduced for the city people: They must gather 1 tonne of cabbage, 600 kg of beets, 500 kg of potatoes, and 500 kg of carrots.

Ukraine Farmers Withhold Products, Seek Profits

PM2509143390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2130 GMT 21 SEP 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Announcer] While parliaments continue discussing the economic reform, there is growing evidence of the disintegration of our economy and the spread of anarchy. Every day we see examples of this. In the Ukraine, for instance, a good harvest has been gathered. But we are unlikely to receive Ukrainian produce in the near future.

[Announcer] There is a shortfall of 4 million tonnes even regarding the requisite level of grain product deliveries in the republic. What is the explanation for this?

[S.A. Tislitskaya, collective farm chairman] The explanation is that we must earn something from this harvest. We must make some kind of profit. This is what we are after. We will exchange products for slate, for cement, for timber. We will exchange our products for goods needed on the farm.

[Announcer] And this is what is happening everywhere. Well, the actions of farm managers are understandable. Moreover, everyone is waiting for 1 October, for the introduction of the new market relations.

Disruptions in Meat Deliveries Examined

PM2609123390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 24 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Every day there are reports about disruptions of meat deliveries to the country's industrial centers. Russia, Belorussia, the Ukraine, Lithuania, Estonia, and Kazakhstan are among the culprits. Over the past eight months Moscow, for instance, has not received 71,000 tonnes of meat which it was due to receive. What is the reason?

[Correspondent] One of the answers to this question is to be found at these gates. Trucks arrive all the time at the Pinsk meat combine in Belorussia, where livestock from four rayons in Brest Oblast specializing in livestock raising is delivered. But as you can see, the trucks are being turned back. The problem, it appears, is virtually the same as that which has brought about the notorious tobacco shortages. The combine's reconstruction has been under way for the past two years, and it is difficult to say when it will be finished. We did not see any construction workers, by the way.

Meanwhile, on nearby farms, such as this one, the kolkhoz [collective farm] imeni Gorkiy, where one of the republic's best livestock raising complexes is located, the livestock yards are completely full of fattened cattle for which there is no market. We also visited the neigboring Iskra Kolkhoz. It has been breeding sheep for a long time, and very successfully. The chairman despairs and says that they will have to change their specialization unless the situation changes.

[K.V. Linkevich, chairman of Iskra Kolkhoz] Over the past two months we have lost at least 20,000.

[Correspondent] You have incurred losses of 20,000 rubles?

[Linkevich] Yes.

[Correspondent] Have you tried to find a solution?

[Linkevich] We wanted to take our meat to the Ukraine, to nearby Lvov. But there they keep our meat for themselves, they do not distribute it through the state stocks. It has been suggested that we send it to Poland for processing. But there is a strange logic here. In short, we seem unable to sell our meat on our own market.

[Correspondent] So this is what happens to contract commitments! It is not those who disrupt them but those who work hardest who are punished. It would be wrong to think that this is an isolated case.

A few days ago the government concluded an agreement for the purchase of 200,000 tonnes of meat in the GDR. It will not be unwelcome, of course. But why waste our own meat, especially if it has been reared in accordance with an order?

Scientific

Progress M-5 Cargo Spacecraft Launched

LD2709134690 Moscow TASS in English 1340 GMT 27 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 27 TASS—The Soviet Union launched an unmanned cargo spacecraft today in keeping with a program of work on board the scientific research platform Mir (Peace).

The freighter, Progress M-5, carries expendable materials and other cargoes for Mir.

It also carries, for the first time, a prototype of recoverable ballistic capsule, which will be used in the future to return the results of scientific studies to earth.

According to telemetry data, the freighter's on-board systems are working normally.

Mir Cosmonauts Continue Research, Experiments

LD2509140890 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 25 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent at the "Mission Control Center"]

[Text] Moscow September 25 TASS—Cosmonauts Gennadiy Manakov and Gennadiy Strekalov continue working aboard the orbital complex Mir. The research programme being implemented during the flight includes astrophysical, geophysical and technological experiments.

By means of the Buket and Granat spectrometers, designed at the Moscow Engineering Physics Institute and the Leningrad Physics and Technology Institute, the cosmonauts gauge spatial and energy characteristics of X-ray, gamma-ray and neutron radiation of cosmic origin along the flight path of the manned orbital complex.

Under the geophysical research plan, the space crew go ahead with experiments to determine the spectral characteristics of the "space-atmosphere-surface" transitional zones in infra-red and visible wavebands. The cosmonauts use instruments mounted on the remote-controlled stabilised platform of the Kvant-2 module.

The cosmonauts launched a 14-hour cycle to grow high-quality monocrystal of zinc oxide on the Gallar technological installation.

The cosmonauts are in good health. The flight is proceeding according to schedule.

Space Chief Interviewed on Aerospace Exhibition

LD2509221990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] At the first international aerospace exhibition held in Moscow, a meeting between the leaders of Soviet space firms and journalists took place today. Our special correspondent Leonid Lazarevich interviewed Aleksandr Ivanovich Dunayev, head of Glavkosmos [Main Space Administration].

[Begin recording] [Lazarevich] Aleksandr Ivanovich, the exhibition has coincided with the completion of the first stage of the Soviet-German project Kazimir.

[Dunayev] The essence of the project was that on the Foton object created by the Central Council of Design Bureaus, we took the commercial cargo of the Kaiser trade firm into orbit and provided for the fulfilment of the entire program. The experiment was carried out successfully. It was not the first experiment with this firm. Next year we plan about three experiments.

[Lazarevich] The firm's representative reported that very valuable catalysts were obtained, which presumably will be used in the oil industry. The Glavkosmos already has orders from abroad worth over 50 million foreign currency rubles. This exhibition showed the interest of foreign specialists in our space technology.

[Dunayev] Special interest was shown by French specialists who are now seeking cooperation with us. The French specialists were very interested in our powerful engines. They admired our complex at Baykonur—the elegance and the simplicity of these designs compared to the designs they have at Ariane complex. They are very interested in our space achievements, but our task is not to conclude immediate contracts. We are working today in this direction and the exhibition is not over yet. I think in a day or two we will know for sure what we will get from it.

[Lazarevich] The allocations for space research are being cut now; in any case there is a lot of talk about it. Can foreign orders fill in the capacities that are being freed?

[Dunayev] It all depends on the efficiency of the actions of our Glavkosmos as well as on the efficiency of the enterprises themselves. This is the main goal we are working toward now. [end recording]

Aviation-90 Exhibition Ends in Moscow

LD2609224190 Moscow TASS in English 2025 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS special correspondent Yuriy Stepanov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The full-scale models of Yak-55M and Su-26MX aircraft and of BOR-4 and BOR-5 space probes and also mockups of Il-76 GD and Il-96-300 aircraft were displayed in the Soviet section of the Aviation-90 specialised international exhibition which ended on Wednesday [26 September].

The exhibition was organised by the West German firm Gebrueder Helbing Industrie-Messen GMBH with the assistance of the all-Union Expocentre Association of the

USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the ministries of the Aviation Industry and Civil Aviation and the USSR chief space administration—Glavkosmos.

The exhibition was of a purely commercial nature and the first event of its kind in the USSR. Participants conducted business negotiations, many of which were capped with deals.

The show drew over 160 foreign companies from 16 countries. The Soviet display was the largest: it featured some 1,000 exhibits. Ninety eight enterprises of the aviation and aerospace industries showed their achievements.

Participants attended seminars on the subjects "prospects for the development of aviation", "the organisation of the tests and trial operation of aircraft using liquified natural gas and liquid hydrogren as fuel", "aviation and problems of the ecology" and "prospects for the development and use of new materials". Both Soviet and foreign specialists spoke at the seminars.

Foreign A-310 and Douglas Md-80 and Soviet Il-96-300 and Tu-204 aircraft were displayed at Moscow's Sheremetyevo-1 airport. Aircraft of new models made exhibition flights on the Moscow-Leningrad route.

FRG Firm, Energiya Association Sign Memorandum

LD2609225190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Summary] Oleg Kolin reports on a promising joint enterprise. The well-known West German communications firm ANT Bosch Telecom is interested in developing relations with the Energiya scientific production association in Kaliningrad, founded by Academician Korolev, where Molniya-1, the first communications satellite, was made. The Soviet enterprise proposes to use the Energiya rocket to launch heavy communications satellites into orbit. The all-Union association Energiya-Marafon [as heard] was recently set up in order to carry out the project. A memorandum on cooperation between the association and ANT Bosch Telecom was signed yesterday.

'Revolutionary' Aircraft-Hydroplane Developed

LD2609124690 Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Panov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—A revolutionary new aircraft, which Soviet aircraft builders have christened a screencraft, has been designed by specialists here.

It will be a unique apparatus, combining the qualities of an aircraft and a hydroplane, representatives from the Soviet-Singapore aircraft-building joint venture told a news conference here on Tuesday.

The screencraft will be able to fly considerable distances. It has increased manoeuvrability on water, highly economic operation and low cost, venture co-director Mikhail Simonov said.

The qualities are achieved due to the screening effect, which produces an air cushion under the craft over the water. The screencraft will have two decks, one for passengers and the other for cargo.

The project has been elaborated at the Soviet Sukhoy design bureau and is being implemented by the Soviet ministries of the shipbuilding and aircraft industries and the Singapore Aeromarine firm. The screencraft will be built by Soviet enteprises.

Singapore Aeromarine director George Woo noted that his firm will contribute electronic systems for the venture and will help sell the product. He said the market embraces countries of the Asian-Pacific region.

Simonov noted that the project is the result of Soviet military conversion.

Funding Problems Hinder Use of Radio Telescope

PM2609134290 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Interview with G.Ya. Smolkov, doctor of physicomathematical sciences and acting director of the Siberian Radio Astrophysical Laboratory by V. Kodkin, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Despite the fact that the USSR Academy of Sciences has all the material resources at its disposal, lack of funding is still taking its toll on the development of basic research, in particular, on the new radio astrophysical laboratory under the Siberian Institute of Earth Magnetism, the Ionosphere, and Wave Propagation.

[Kodkin] Scientists call it the solar laboratory for short because its purpose is to study the star closest to us. It is observed using a unique instrument—a radio telescope with a reflector 622 m in diameter formed by 256 radio antennae. That is the number of sharp eyes that converge on the sun with equal curiosity and attention in any weather. It is well known that we live in an atmosphere ruled by the star which gave us life. And everything is dependent on its behavior—the climate, harvests, our own health, and, lastly, our longevity. It is a shame that the gigantic radio telescope near the city of Sayan, which was developed to carry out in-depth basic research, is only exploited to five to 10 percent of capacity. Will the observatory there be able to enhance the effectiveness of its research?

[Smolkov] The mechanism for funding basic science is well known today. Many of our associated organizations, many of the observatory's practical and academic institutes are all worrying now and are in a very difficult situation with regard to labor remuneration and supplies because they also lacked funding in the past. Ties with

interested sectors are lessening in connection with the fact that conditions of funding are also interfering in the activity of interested parties and leading organizations. A truly unique solar observatory is being born amid the torment involved in the transition to the market. Will it be viable? Yes, provided that we think about the future while in the midst of our current problems.

High-Energy Physics Seminar Opens in Dubna

LD2409211190 Moscow TASS in English 2046 GMT 24 Sep 90

[Report by TASS correspondent]

[Text] Dubna September 24 TASS—The tenth international seminar on high-energy physics opened in Dubna, Moscow region, on Monday. The seminar is sponsored by the Joint Institute of Nuclear Research of which eleven countries are members and by the scientific council of the USSR Academy of Sciences on electromagnetic interaction.

The seminar is attended by some 250 physicists—theoreticians and experimenters—from 20 countries. The Soviet Union is represented at the seminar by scientists from 37 research institutions, universities and organisations including regional and republican centres of nuclear physics.

The main theme of the seminar is the discussion of problems of relativist nuclear physics and quantum chromodynamics. This new trend of physics originated from Dubna. Scientists of the European Organisation for Nuclear Research in Geneva and of the Brookhaven National Laboratory in the United States, as well as scientists in Japan and France started working on problems of relativist nuclear physics in the recent years. Projects for powerful nuclear accelerators are being implemented.

The construction of a nuclear accelerator to high energies of the nucleus is being concluded in high-energy laboratory in Dubna. This will be the first accelerator of relativist nuclei on super-conductive magnets. The seminar will last for a week.

New Aviation Monthly Published in Moscow

LD2609123390 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS Correspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—A new popular science aviation monthly "SAMOLYOT" (AIRCRAFT) has come off the press here in Russian and English. It will highlight aviation and space achievements.

"The publication of this magazine was made possible by perestroika and glasnost in the Soviet Union, by the new political thinking and the improvement of the international climate," the publishers say.

Specialists are now becoming increasingly interested in broader contacts, exchanges of information and experience. The magazine is intended to inform aviation experts of new scientific ideas and original technologies.

Readers will be able to learn about the work of scientific laboratories and design bureaus, events at testing grounds, airfields and aircraft building enterprises.

The monthly will publish comments by leading Soviet experts on international air shows and their views on the future of aviation. Test pilots will describe new craft.

The magazine is published by the joint Soviet-American "Aviatika" enterprise, the USSR Aircraft Builders' Society, the NOVOSTI NEWS AGENCY and the International Aviation Support Fund.

Military

Vasiliyev Chairs Debate Over Coup Speculations

LD2609161390 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 25 Sep 90

["Update Debate" discussion program chaired by Peter Vasiliyev, with Colonel Valeriy Pogrebenkov, military observer for NOVOSTI News Agency; and Andrey Kortunov, scientific researcher at the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences]

[Excerpts] [Vasiliyev] Hello and welcome to "Update Debate." I am Peter Vasilyev and today with me in the studio are Colonel Valeriy Pogrebenkov, military observer for NOVOSTI Information Agency, and politologist Andrey Kortunov, scientific researcher of the United States and Canada Institute of the Academy of Sciences. And the subject for today's discussion is whether a military takeover is possible in the Soviet Union. From your point of view Valeriy?

[Pogrebenkov] Well, I should say that there are several speculations in the Soviet press about a kind of military coup in this country. [passage omitted] All these speculations made some people think that military coup may occur in this country.

[Vasiliyev] Andrey, what are the reasons behind these speculations or articles from your point of view—speculations as Valeriy called them? Maybe you agree or disagree. What are the reasons from your point of view?

[Kortunov] Well, I think that first of all people are scared. Apocalyptic thinking is in vogue now in Moscow; people are waiting for something terrible to happen and a possible military coup d'etat is just one of the options they are thinking of. Even without any rationale behind that, they are simply scared that something can happen. Second, I think people feel that the Army can play an important role in the political life. They remember Baku, they remember Tbilisi and that cannot but influence their attitude towards the Army. Finally, of course, one should take care that some of the speeches, as Valeriy put

it, made by our military do give some grounds for such concern because some of them are not very responsible, some of them are too explicit, and I think that people, particularly liberals, are afraid that a kind of alliance can be made between the conservative elements in the party apparatus, in the state bureaucracy and the military. Of course, when they are thinking about military coup d'etat I think that they have a very vague vision how it can happen because nobody can foresee any specific scenario of a coup d'etat and I do not think that anybody has tried to see, well, to make a forecast when it can happen, under what circumstances and how it can happen. But the general reason is, of course, that something terrible can take place in this country. [passage omitted]

[Pogrebenkov] So, to sum it up I should say that generals, at least part of them, try also to help perestroyka, but they see it in their own military way, and try to solve the problems with the means they have in hand.

[Vasiliyev] Andrey, what is your position on the situation?

[Kortunov] Well, I think I basically agree with what was said here, but I would also want to add that our generals have their own vision of the national security of the country, and sometimes they think that this—quote, unquote—new political thinking was leading the Soviet Union too far, that we made too many concessions, and we got too little in return, both in strategic arms, in conventional sphere, and even in our, in the changes of our geostrategical position in the world. (?You know), some of them claim that, for example, the fact that we—again quote, unquote—lost Eastern Europe, made our military situation highly vulnerable, and they do not share the point of view of liberals that our foreign policy was just one big triumph in five last years. So I think that their assessment of the foreign and military policy changes also creates a kind of frustration among them, though the question is, from my point of view, is how well, how solid the position of these generals is within military themselves, because we have a kind of reformation, if I may put it in such a way. Within the military we can see a lot of younger officers who are very radical, who are very intelligent, sometimes very liberal, probably more radical than civilians, and I think that it creates a situation when the generals, the conservative generals, cannot fully rely on their junior associates, and of course it undermines their positions and undermines their political power.

[Vasilyev] That was politilogist Andrey Kortunov. Though the issue of a military coup d'etat in the Soviet Union is highly hypothetical, a number of Soviet newspapers wrote about an unusually strange activity of, by a number of paratroopers detachment [as heard] deployed near Moscow. The Soviet parliament, discussing these articles, demanded the KGB head, Vladimir Kryuchkov, to explain the situation. And my question is: Are you satisfied with what he explained to the Soviet parliamentarians? And his explanation, let me put it very briefly, was that they were helping farmers on the fields.

[Pogrenbenkov] Well, only to some extent, and frankly speaking I was not satisfied with his explanation. Neither was I satisfied with the explanation made by the Soviet head of military establishment, Marshal Yazov. So he explained that—I try to remind our listeners of what was said. So, when Mr. Gorbachev was with his team in Helsinki, it was in the beginning of last September [as heard], so a paratroop regiment was moved from Ryazan—it is three hours from Moscow by train—to Moscow, and the explanation was that this unit was ready to help the collective farmers in their job. But my question is: Why did they need the armed [as heard] protective jackets? So Marshal Yazov also explained that it is a kind of planned movement of this unit, and they were ready to take part in the military parade on 7 November this year. But again, my question is: What and why do they need armed protective jackets for that purpose? And next point is that when they moved from their, as we call it, winter houses, winter location in Ryazan, that winter location was occupied by another paratrooper unit. Perhaps, well, these speculations about, well, paratrooper movements here in the suburbs of Moscow have some grounds, and need to be remembered.

[Vasilyev] That was Valeriy Pogrenbenkov. Andrey Kortunov—my question to you is: You mentioned briefly previously that the Soviet people are afraid of Soviet Army, having in mind the developments in Baku and Tbilisi. Such a strange activity on behalf of a number of paratroopers' detachments near Moscow—could it be viewed as part of a scenario, kind of a preparation for something which could give us a hint that some plans are carried out, some preparation is carried out in case such a situation could spark off?

[Kortunov] Well, of course, theoretically one can imagine that it is just a rehearsal for something like what happened in Baku or Tbilisi. I think that a more feasible explanation would be that it was an attempt just to show the muscles, to show that the Army is able, that they are ready, and probably it was a kind of blackmail, from my point of view, just to show to the liberals in power in Moscow, and maybe in power in Leningrad and some major cities of the country at large that they are not the masters, they are not the only people in charge, that their powers are limited, and they can be limited even more if they go into too much extremes. So I do not think that it was a kind of, you know, rehearsal for a coup d'etat, but I think it was just a sign from the military that they are still effective and they can act if they are asked to act by the leadership of the country.

[Vasilyev] [passage omitted] My next question to both of you gentlemen is: How likely is such an attempt to take place amid growing disagreement, controversy in parliament and in the society, sharp economic crisis and

dissatisfaction expressed openly by a number of Soviet generals and by a number of Soviet military? Valeriy?

[Pogrebenkov] My short answer will be it is unlikely, and I will try to present my position here. At least we have to see two sides of the coin in this affair. On the one hand we have very poor social protection of the military. I have got figures (?spent) for the houses the military is provided with. So, approximately 200,000 military are not provided with their houses. So there is kind of social unrest in the Armed Forces, in the Soviet Armed Forces, and I may present a great number of other figures and reasons why the people may not be satisfied with what is happening in this country. But on the other hand I should say that there should not be and will not be any zero hour—well, I have to explain it—a certain plan, prepared plan for military coup, because I go on with my speculation. For instance, from the military point of view and technical point of view some paratroop regiments may capture the Kremlin, may arrest the Soviet Government. It may happen, from the military and technical point of view. What will the military do with the power they capture? It is very easy just to capture the power, but it is very difficult to hold it. Will the rest of the military—I mean junior officers, privates, sergeants, and so on—support the top military [word indistinct]? My answer is they will not support. That is why this is the most reasonable ground, for the military coup will not happen in this country. [sentence as heard]

[Vasilyev] That was Valeriy Pogrebenkov.

[Kortunov] I agree with this viewpoint, and I think that, well, Napoleon was right when he said that you can do a lot of things with bayonets, but the only thing you cannot do with them, you cannot sit on them.

[Pogrebenkov] It is uncomfortable to sit on it, yes, for sure.

[Kortunov] And the question is that it is practically impossible to solve any basic economic, social, political, national issues of this country in form of coup d'etat and in form of military rule. So I think that what can happen, and if we are speaking about the worst possible scenario, we can see military, top military, as junior allies to some conservative, nationalistic, maybe even radical political grouping which will take power in Moscow, and which will have social base, which will have political base in the most important regions of the country and which can rely on some parts of the military just to help them go ahead with their conservative reform. You know, if we take the example of the authoritarian regimes after the Second World War, such as the regimes in, let us say, South Korea or in Chile, or in Spain or Portugal, we can see that the military element was pretty strong there, but most of them were not military governments. And I do believe that at certain point the current leadership, or maybe a next [as heard] leadership, will have to limit political democracy. And this will be the price for rapid economic modernization. Because this economic modernization, if we really mean privatization of economy, if we really mean, you know, private property, it will be connected with major social strain. And of course some limits, some straitjacket for the democracy is needed, at least for the time being, and here I think military can play an important role just in taming this democratic sea which is so rough these days.

[Vasilyev] That was Andrey Kortunov. And gentlemen, very briefly as we are running out of time, my last question to you: President Gorbachev has been granted emergency powers by the Soviet parliament. Do you see, if at all, any desire on his part to hold, to secure a firm grip on the situation in order to prevent any unnecessary development of the situation? Valeriy?

[Pogrebenkov] I hope that the Soviet president, Mikhail Gorbachev, should have such right in a kind of transitional period. Whether he will use his power or not, it is a problem, but at least it seems to me that he should have such a right here. And as for the armed forces is concerned [as heard], my feeling is that if it is necessary the armed forces—at least, well I should say, the junior officers—will support what will Gorbachev order [as heard] in order to stabilize situation here and just to help in his perestroyka.

[Vasilyev] Andrey?

[Kortunov] Well, I would prefer a civilized authoritarian regime to uncivilized totalitarian regime, and from this point of view I think that we should, or at least, I would support Gorbachev. I think that he will need support from the part of the military, from the KGB, and I think that perhaps it will create a possibility when the energies of military, of the reasonable military, sober military, can be channeled into the right direction. [passage omitted]

Ministry Official Reports Defense Budget Cuts

PM2609154590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Report from PRAVDA-TASS-INTERFAX roundup under the rubric "Telephone. Teletype. Telefax"]

[Text] Moscow—Colonel General Vladimir Babyev, chief of the USSR Ministry of Defense Central Financial Directorate, has reported that the draft military budget for 1991 provides for a reduction in military appropriations by four billion rubles. Thus, over the past two years, spending on defense in the USSR will have fallen 14 percent from the 1989 level of expenditure.

Defense Committee Urges New Military Service Laws

LD2609171890 Moscow TASS in English 1637 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The Soviet Parliamentary Committee on Defence and State Security today called for drafting new Soviet laws on universal military service and on servicemen's status.

The laws should define standards for the legal protection of servicemen, members of their families and also persons liable to military service, reservists and retired.

USSR People's Deputies, who are members of the committee, said they were worried that the legislative acts so badly needed by the country were being drafted very slowly. The deputies committed the Soviet Defence Ministry to complete the elaboration of a Soviet bill on defence before the end of the year and submit it for consideration to the Soviet Parliament.

At its session in Moscow, the committee also addressed the question of conducting an experiment to staff, on the voluntary, contractual basis, the navy with seamen and petty officers from among servicemen in active duty service.

Baltic Republics

Estonia Discusses 'Economic Border' Issues

LD2709080890 Moscow TASS in English 0751 GMT 27 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn September 27 TASS—The Estonian Parliament will today discuss the first reading of a bill on Estonia's "economic border".

The bill says the economic border is the former land border of the Estonian Soviet Republic, which was in effect on the day Estonia's official name was changed to the Estonian Republic.

The establishment of the economic border should help protect Estonia's domestic market, control immigration, and combat crime, the bill's proponents argue.

Estonian officials will control the movement of people and transport vehicles across the border and the export and import of goods, money, securities, and precious metals.

Control over border crossings is planned to be introduced in three stages.

During the first stage, people crossing the border will have to present their identification cards at border checkpoints. At the second stage, those crossing the border will be obliged to receive a permit at a border checkpoint for a stay in Estonia of not more than one month.

During the third stage, only people having invitations to visit Estonia from local self-government bodies will be given entry permits. Invitations can also be issued by Estonia's permament residents and legal entities registered in Estonian, provided these invitations are endorsed by local authorities.

In future, after Estonia opens its missions in the Soviet Union and its constituent republics, these missions will issue entry visas for crossing the economic border.

The bill also contains articles on customs, postal control, and quarantine.

The bill warns that the illegal crossing of the economic border or a stay in the republic on an invalid permit carry a warning or a fine.

Estonian Faction Seeks Tax Relief For Peasants

LD2609225290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1458 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Tallinn, 26 Sep (TASS)—TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan reports:

The "Independent Democrats" faction, which has approximately 15 percent of the votes in the Estonian parliament and counts on the support of the deputies who are experts in agriculture, has submitted a proposal to the Supreme Soviet of Estonia that peasants should be exempt from taxes on income earned from meat and milk production.

In the opinion of the faction's leader Julo Uliots, the abolition of state subsidies on the production of meat and dairy products approved by the Supreme Soviet at the beginning of this month and the three- to four-fold increase in retail prices announced by the government as of 15 October will not be an incentive for growth in effective livestock breeding in Estonia.

According to the government's plan, the consumer will, by means of the new retail prices, start to subsidize the production—the quantity and quality—of meat and milk.

The change in the source of subsidies, the opponents of this point of view think, will not be of interest to the peasant because expenditures for the storage, processing, transportation, and marketing of the products of livestock breeding—but not their production—are compensated mainly by the subsidies. Thus the abolition of subsidies from the state budget and the rise in retail prices does not promise anything except a fall in the population's standard of living.

Julo Uliots stresses that only a change in taxation policy—complete exemption of the peasant from taxes on the income from the production of meat and milk—can be an effective incentive.

The "independent democrats" propose compensating for the deficit in the state budget caused by the proposed reduction in income tax from workers in the countryside with a one percent increase on the turnover tax, including for the agricultural produce processing complex.

Occupied these days with examining the package of draft laws on taxation, the Supreme Soviet may, Julo Uliots thinks, not approve the proposal of the "Independent Democrats" because the positions of the government and its head Edgar Savisaar in the parliament are sufficiently strong, and the increasingly empty treasury needs restocking at any price.

Estonia Adopts Decree on State Farms

LD2609183390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] The Estonian Government had adopted a decree on setting up state farms based on the most advanced farms in Estonia's rural areas. Some are now being directly subordinated to the Ministry of Agriculture, and others to local district authorities. The state farms are to be guided primarily not by the aim of maximizing profits in market conditions, but of fulfilling orders from the state, supplying the republic's agriculture with stock seed and valuable pedigree animals for the development of

livestock and poultry breeding, and training educated peasants as agricultural specialists.

The government considers it was essential to take this step on the eve of the privatization of agriculture in order to keep under its control the most valuable potential of this important branch of the national economy.

Coverage of Latvian Supreme Soviet Sessions

Alternative Draft Law Adopted

LD2609155690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] At the initiative of deputies of the People's Front, the Latvian Supreme Soviet has submitted amendments and alterations to the law on alternative national service—the republican law, as I understand. Henceforth, it is permitted in Latvia to do such service in militarized units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, customs control, the border guards, and also in specialized detachments. This has aroused serious objections from the Equality Faction. They were, nevertheless, adopted at a first reading.

Economic Resolution Rejected

LD2609181790 Moscow TASS in English 1722 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga September 26 TASS—President of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Anatolijs Gorbunovs said that the main obstacle to the normal functioning of the parliament is slack discipline of deputies. He said this when the draft resolution on speeding up the consideration of economic laws was discussed.

This document is one of the few tabled for the consideration of the parliament by its parliament by its president. Gorbunovs believes that the shaping of production and financial programmes for the next year proceeds in conditions when material resources are in short supply and when laws regulating economic processes are lacking.

Today's agenda includes the draft law on entrepreneurship and joint stock companies. Yesterday the deputies rejected the draft proposed by the president of the Supreme Soviet.

Gorbunovs suggested that the standing commissions shortly discuss President Gorbachev's programme of transition to a market. Gorbunovs suggested that it be discussed by the session. But some deputies objected, saying that there is no need to interfere in the affairs of a neighbouring state.

There was strong opposition to the point in Gorbunovs' draft suggesting that trips abroad should be suspended till the end of the year. Parliamentarians also objected to the president's proposal to apply to parliamentarians lacking discipline such sanctions as are envisaged by labour legislation.

The president believes that only in this way can deputies be made work efficiently. But most deputies do not share this viewpoint. So Gorbunovs' draft was not passed. Only 133 deputies out of the 200 were present during the voting.

Prosecutor General Appointed

LD2709000190 Moscow TASS in English 2059 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Zaitsev]

[Text] Riga September 27 TASS—From now on the Latvian Supreme Soviet will be appointing and discharging the republic's prosecutor-general. Under the law "On the prosecutor's supervision in the Latvian Republic" adopted on Wednesday, the prosecutor-general accounts only to the republic's president. Until now these questions were in the competence of the prosecutor-general of the USSR.

Under the new law, the prosecutor will supervise the observance of the Republic's laws by the KGB and the Interior Ministry, as well as by military units stationed on the Latvian territory and other military organisations.

Prosecutor of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Valentin Dauksis told a news conference on Tuesday that, quite possibly, the "Lithunaian variant will be repeated—two procurator's offices will be existing in the Republic. One will function within the Union system of the procurator's offce, while the other will be absolutely independent. He believes that this situation can hardly help decrease crime rate in Latvia.

Dauksis said that the maintenance of the republican bodies of the procurator's office annually costs the Union budget five million roubles. Now the Republic should supply these funds.

A telegram from the USSR prosecutor-general was read out at the session. He expressed concern over the adoption of the decisions that run counter to the Constitution of the USSR and the law of the USSR on the procurator's office. This address actually went unanswered.

Janes Skrastins, 41, was appointed Latvia's prosecutor-general. Prior to this appointment he was deputy prosecutor of Latvia.

Further on Appointment

LD2609132190 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0900 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] The Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia adopted a resolution this morning on prosecutorial supervision in our republic, and also a resolution on the procedure of its coming into force. The need to establish the Republic of Latvia's prosecutor arose from these

documents. Therefore, it was proposed to include on the agenda of today's plenary session the question of appointing a prosecutor general of the Republic of Latvia and his deputy.

Anatolijs Gorbunovs, making use of his rights as chairman of the Supreme Council, recommended that Janes Skrastins be appointed prosecutor general of the Republic of Latvia. Deputies questioned the candidate. A debate took place chiefly on whether it is lawful to appoint the prosecutor general without changing the constitution. The jurists found this possible.

Janis Skrastins was elected prosecutor general of the Republic of Latvia.

Latvian Group Urges Boycott of Soviet Forces

LD2609101990 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] The USSR Armed Forces stationed on Latvian territory, including in the region of Liepaja, are ignoring local authorities' resolutions and the concerns of society. Army men degrade and pollute the environment and create a feeling of discomfort among inhabitants. The consequences of the activity at the Pape [training] range; the false amber [pieces of phosphorus, mistaken for amber, which cause serious burns]; the helicopter base at Paplaka; and the radar equipment at Vainode, Pavilosta, Nica rural district, Akmengrava, Rucava, and Liepaja can all be mentioned.

The Liepaja branch of the People's Front has adopted a resolution in which it appeals to all levels of councils, organizations, establishments, and also to the citizens and inhabitants of the Republic of Latvia to discontinue any cooperation with the USSR Armed Forces. It is possible that pressure or a blockade of this kind will at last make the leadership of the armed forces introduce order.

Latvian Council of Ministers Session Canceled

LD2609123290 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Excerpts] A session of the Latvian Council of Ministers due to be held today will not take place. The agenda questions will be examined on 1 October. [passage omitted]

Lithuanian, USSR Delegations To Meet 2 Oct

LD2709084790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 27 September broadcasts a live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. At 0717 GMT, Deputy Coslovas Jursenas, spokesman for the government, makes the following announcement:

"This morning Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, made a telephone call to our esteemed prime minister, Kazimiera Prunskiene, and said that upon instructions from President Mikhail Gorbachev he proposed to fix a date and hour for a meeting between the USSR delegation and the delegation from the Republic of Lithuania.

"I think you must have heard about the idea itself. The esteemed prime minister spoke about it after she returned from the latest meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev; she said, namely, that instructions to that effect had been given to Nikolay Ryzhkov. Ryzhkov therefore made a phone call this morning and proposed that the first meeting between the delegations take place next Tuesday [2 Oct] in Moscow at 1000 Moscow mean time [0700 GMT].

"So this is the news. This is what Moscow, the opposite side in the negotiations we are seeking, proposes."

Landsbergis Discusses Negotiations With Moscow

LD2609210190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] An opinion that the negotiations with the Soviet Union may start has been expressed by the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis. Today he spoke at a news conference in the Supreme Council. If a meeting with the Kremlin representatives takes place, maybe the question concerning the coming negotiations will be agreed upon. They could start by the signing of an initial protocol, and also the place, time, frequency of the meetings and so on could be discussed.

Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Council Ceslovas Stankevicius informed the journalists that the commission headed by him is preparing a draft project of political and legal bases for the negotiations with the Russian Federation. Two official meetings have already taken place. It is possible that another meeting will take place at the end of this month, and we will be able to coordinate the positions of both sides.

Preparations for the negotiations with the Soviet Union were described by Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Council Bronislovas Kuzmickas.

Replies to the journalists' questions were given by the chairman of the foreign affairs commission of the Supreme Council, Emanuelis Zingeris.

Remarks on Moscow's 'Changed' View

LD2609170890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1610 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Vilnius, 26 Sep (ELTA-TASS)—"The Soviet Union's view of Lithuanian independence has changed somewhat recently," believes Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council. "Clearly, the Kremlin already realizes that our determination to

secure full state independence is immutable," he said today at a press conference in the Lithuanian capital.

At the same time, turning to the forthcoming talks with the Soviet Union, Landsbergis noted that the Kremlin is evidently still hoping that it will manage to persuade Lithuania to remain within a renewed Soviet Union. In Vytautas Landsbergis's opinion, the USSR leadership wishes to probe the identity of the positions of all three Baltic republics even before the start of the talks.

Lithuanian Intelligence Chief Discusses Goals

AU2609183090 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 26 Sep 90 p 10

[Interview with Mecys Laurinkas, Sajudis deputy in the Lithuanian parliament and head of the newly founded Lithuanian Intelligence Service, by Stephan Lamby; place and date not given: "Every Government Needs an Intelligence Service"]

[Text] [Lamby] You are building up a Lithuanian intelligence service. What is its task?

[Laurinkas] Our government must be provided with unofficial information. For instance, Lithuania now has new ties with a great number of states, and these ties require operational treatment. This means that we supply information to the government which cannot be found in newspapers. On the basis of this information we then make forecasts of future developments. A government simply needs something like this.

[Lamby] This means your people work both at home and abroad?

[Laurinkas] Yes.

[Lamby] In which area do you cooperate with your colleagues from the Soviet KGB?

[Laurinkas] Exclusively in the area of organized crime.

[Lamby] What is the size of your intelligence service?

[Laurinkas] That is a professional secret.

[Lamby] The Lithuanian people have had their special experiences with intelligence services. Does the establishment of a new intelligence service not hinder Lithuania's democratic development?

[Laurinkas] I do not think so. In the United States it works. If our tasks are defined by law, and if the parliamentary supervision of our activities works, there are no problems. The KGB, on the other hand, worked for years without any corresponding laws.

[Lamby] What is the legal basis for your work?

[Laurinkas] At the moment we are working on a corresponding draft law, and as long as this law has not been passed we cannot claim to work in accord with any law. By the way, the KGB is also preparing its own law at the moment. In the future, part of the KGB is to be subordinate to the Interior Ministry and another part to the president, depending on the tasks. This reform is an attempt to orient itself toward the U.S. example.

[Lamby] After the democratic revolution in the GDR, the existing State Security Service was not reformed nor was a new intelligence service established. On the contrary, the dissolution of the "Stasi" was decided. The process of democratization in Lithuania seems to be going in a different direction.

[Laurinkas] I do not want to comment on the events in the GDR. But here in Lithuania, too, the dissolution of the Lithuanian branch of the KGB was decided. However, reality is different because, in practice, the KGB continues its work here. Apart from that, it is quite impossible to dissolve it all at once.

[Lamby] On the walls of houses in Vilnius one often sees graffiti saying "Red Army Go Home." Do you agree with this demand?

[Laurinkas] Yes, as a citizen of an independent state I naturally agree with it. However I also understand that the withdrawal cannot be carried out by tomorrow. In this respect, I completely trust our government which is negotiating on this issue with the Soviet Union.

[Lamby] As chief of the Lithuanian Intelligence Service do you not also have to cooperate with the Soviet Army stationed in Lithuania?

[Laurinkas] No, there are no contacts at all.

[Lamby] In various areas of the Soviet Union, or rather the former Soviet Union, voices are increasingly heard that speak of an imminent civil war. How do you assess this danger?

[Laurinkas] It is correct that these voices are multiplying. But they are controlled by foreign forces. I see such a danger for Russia because despair there might drive the people into a civil war. In Lithuania, however, the standard of living is far higher than the average standard of living in the Soviet Union, and therefore I do not believe that war will break out here. In addition, the people in our country have more of a Western mentality which would prevent them from engaging in such a conflict.

[Lamby] When do you think Lithuania will have achieved complete independence from the Soviet Union?

[Laurinkas] This will take until development in East Europe as a whole, and Russia in particular, stabilizes.

[Lamby] What do you, as chief of an intelligence service, contribute to making this development take such a course?

[Laurinkas] It is my task, as I said before, to acquire and evaluate information. However, I think that in this field

we should no longer struggle against each other as in the past but, on the contrary, we should help each other in order to achieve better mutual understanding.

Lithuania Adopts Resolution on Political Parties

LD2609145390 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Vilnius September 26 TASS—The Lithuanian parliament approved a bill on political parties late last night. It says that "no political parties of other states, their sections or organisations can be set up or funciton on the territory of the Lithuanian republic.

"The programme or rules of a new political party must not contradict the laws of the Lithuanian republic. Political parties can be set up only according to the territorial principle. Political parties cannot function within working collectives".

"Since Lithuania is a part of the USSR, the document contradicts the principles of its democratic development," member of the Soviet Communist Party Politburo and Lithuanian Pro-union Communist Party Chief Mikolas Burokevicius believes. "Even if viewed from positions of the national Sajudis movement, which advocates a bourgeois Lithuanian state, the law contradicts the concept of democracy, reduces to nought all the statements by current Lithuanian leaders on pluralism and tolerance towards different trends of thought".

Burokevicius believes the law on political parties "only strengthens the power of a handful of people, primarily and personally Landsbergis. It is another step to strengthen his regime. Dissatisfaction with the concentration of power in the hands of a group of people is growing even within the Sajudis movement," he said.

President Vytautas Landsbergis told the session about the political situation in the republic. Touching on the republic's participation in the federal treaty, he said Lithuania not only refuses to sign this document, but does not even intend to conclude long-term economic agreements with the Soviet Union.

Landsbergis urged parliament to appeal to the United Nations to investigate the status of national minorities in Lithuania from the point of view of humsn rights and to form a special commission for this purpose.

Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Party Urges Roundtable

PM2609104190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Sep 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Yu. Stroganov: "Notes from the Final Sitting of the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Congress: Arguments Will Unite...."]

[Text] Vilnius—"You would do better to write about the fact that while we had no blockade, we did have economic sanctions," N. Placiekyte, a young member of a kolkhoz [collective farm] from Zarasayskiy Rayon, told me instead of an interview. "Yes, we did experience considerable difficulties, but it was not a blockade, however. It reached a ludicrous pitch: Friends from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] sent me... matches. Friends were sent some salt.... And yet our store counters were fuller than Russia's even at that time. But we will actually lose a lot if the land is sold off, as the present Lithuanian leadership plans. The farmers are against forcible decollectivization...."

N. Placiekyte also spoke about the peasants' anxieties from the rostrum of the final sitting of the 21st Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) Congress. Many other rural working people among the delegates also devoted their speeches to this topic. It worries everyone, and this was clear. It was said that the parliament's present policy is against the people, land will be bought by operators in the shadow economy, and that peasants will become hired hands on it. Ordinary peasants will have nothing to cultivate if the kolkhozes are broken up.

Anxiety about the future bound up with the plans for forcible privatization and the course of breaking away from the USSR was clearly voiced. Incidentally, the majority of the speeches on this topic were delivered in Lithuanian. I mention this because certain circles claim for propaganda purposes that the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) is a party of Russians only. Political ambitions are alien to working people, irrespective of nationality. As congress delegate A. Kazlauskas, an agronomist, said, if you have bread and your health, everything is okay.

The Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) program adopted at the final sitting reads: "The defense of working people's vital interests and the implementation of their socialist choice constitute the Lithuanian Communist Party's main social mission." It advocates the exclusion of any pressure whatever in the choice of forms of agricultural management and the legalization of the transfer of land to collectives—kolkhozes and sovkhozes [state farms]—and individual peasants in perpetuity, with the right of inheritance for individual owners. The party considers that equal opportunities for free development must be granted to different forms of farm, and that agrarian transformations in the republic can be carried out only after they have been discussed and approved by the majority of the peasantry.

"Farmers propose that a referendum be held," A. Kazlauskas said from the rostrum.

Congress delegates also spoke of the need to conclude as quickly as possible a Union Treaty and implement the decisions of the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the "Lithuanian question" and they considered Moscow's talks with Vilnius and the transfer to market relations. These topics worry hundreds of thousands of people. They were also aired at the settlement of Yanushay, Shalchininskiy Rayon—which was visited by the Lithuanian Communists' guest O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central

Committee—and in other places where he held conversations, which were emotional and impassioned, with Lithuanian working people.

The documents adopted at the final stage of the congress show the constructive nature of the approaches to solving problems. A scientific analysis of the situation and ways of overcoming the crisis are outlined in a number of the Communist Party's resolutions and in its program.

"But what is the point of having our own program and organizational basis?"—some Communists ask. "We have the documents adopted by the 28th CPSU Congress...." They are necessary in order to take real account of the national, territorial, and economic features of the republic. The Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) is an autonomous political organization guided in its activity by the CPSU program documents. Its new program says: "The Lithuanian Communist Party advocates a democratic, rule-of-law, Lithuanian state of a socialist type which ensures its real sovereignty and territorial integrity; the development of the economy and culture; social justice; and the implementation of the population's civil rights and duties."

That is the strategic aim. But how is it to be reached? Having overcome the rally stage in its activity, the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) is ready to take a decisive step, the prelude to which was the idea of a roundtable discussion.

"We must carry out the political consolidation of forces," said Klaipeda delegate A. Lavritov. "And perhaps support sensible people from other parties, people heading in the same direction...."

How can one disagree with him. In a situation where the CPSU is not guaranteed a monopoly of power—and this has shown itself particularly in Lithuania—a qualitatively different approach to relations with other political organizations is essential.

This same idea—the need to establish relations with public organizations and movements—was also stressed at the congress by Prof. J. Jermalavicius, doctor of historical sciences. You cannot help noticing that this idea is knocking on the door increasingly insistently. The idea has also been incorporated in the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) program: "The Communist Party is in favor of the principle of political consensus on the fundamental questions of the republic's social development...."

However, doubt persists as to whether agreement is possible at all among movements which have different ideas of the route to sovereignty. Is the implementation of the idea of uniting such forces in a bloc likely? I asked this question during the post-congress press conference.

"We have proposed the idea of joint action," M.M. Burokevicius said. "We can act jointly with members of the reorganized Lithuanian Communist Party, Social Democrats, moderate members of Sajudis, the trade unions.... We support cooperation."

"A roundtable and unification to form blocs—how can one exist without this?" said O.S. Shenin. "Not all movements are extremist, many of them voice constructive criticism—including criticism of the CPSU—and put forward proposals. It is necessary to seek agreement with all who adopt reasonable positions and to fight together to win over the voters and people's feelings."

The search for points of contacts—I am convinced that this is a very important means of overcoming the crisis, although there are forces keen to profit from confrontation. But it is essential that all progressive movements cast ambition aside in the face of potential misfortune and hold out a hand to one another because our mistakes and oversights will be reflected first and foremost in the fate of of N. Placiekyte and all honest working people.

Lithuanian Leadership Responds to CPSU Appeal

90UN2831D Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 18 Sep 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by S. Bykhun, TASS correspondent in Vilnius: "The Dialogue Is Not Turning Out"]

[Text] The recent appeal of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to the Communists and population of Lithuania evoked wide response among the republic's residents and public.

The Lithuanian leadership also reacted to it immediately. Appearing on republic television on that same day, V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, expressed himself in the sense that "the Kremlin's leaders" allegedly have prepared ways "not to permit negotiations or to delay their beginning as long as possible."

The TASS correspondent asked M. Burokevicius, a member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Lithuanian CPSU, to express his opinion with respect to the appeal of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo to the Communists and the population of Lithuania and the speech of V. Landsbergis on republic television.

"The entire appeal of the Politburo, in the opinion of the first secretary, is set forth in a benevolent tone with respect to the Lithuanian people. It is aimed at a radical renewal of the life of the workers of the republic, and in addition on the basis of legal and democratic principles. And there is only one way to do this—through the signing of a Union treaty, and not through the secession of Lithuania from the USSR. [no close quotation marks as published]

As for Landsbergis' statement, it is not accidental. First, it set the task of somehow raising the abruptly shaky authority of the Supreme Council; second, it aimed at supercharging interethnic passions in the republic; and

third, one can clearly see in it a summons for confrontation with the leadership of the Soviet Union.

In a political sense the Landsbergis statement was adventurist, believes the leader of the Lithuanian Communists. It showed once again that the Lithuanian leadership is conscientiously for a break in negotiations with the USSR and against the signing of a Union treaty.

Lessons Learned From Lithuanian Party Demise

90UN2831C Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
5 Sep 90 p 3

[Letter from historian Albinas Visockas, prepared by Tadas Savarskis; published under the rubric "From Wednesday to Wednesday Digest: Lithuanian Press": "It Is Not Too Late to Take a Stand"]

[Text] "It Is Not Too Late To Take a Stand" is the title of an open letter from historian Albinas Visockas to members of the Lithuanian CPSU and the Lithuanian Communist Party which, as the author himself says, TARYBU LIETUVA, TIESA, and even "the very democratic" LIETUVOS RYTAS refused to print but RESPUBLIKA did print in its 30 August issue.

"Anticommunist attitudes are strengthening and spreading like fire in all of East Europe and in Lithuania, and probably not by the day but by the hour. The way some of our fellow countrymen look at us Communists unfortunately brings to mind the reaction of a bull to a red flag.

"A distinctive syndrome of the red flag is quickly formed in an atmosphere of general agitation, the enthusiastic opening of wounds that have already healed, and excessive speculation about the past. Common sense, the nice slogans of unity and rebirth, and the interests of affirming independence are no longer applied. We, the members of the independent Lithuanian Communist Party, are watching from the sidelines how our former party friends—but now CPSU platformists, having closed their eyes—are moving out to meet their sad fate. To tell the truth, we are not very sympathetic toward them as they are now because they chose their own fate and, in a very a decisive moment for Lithuania, they split the Communist Party and they came out against the legal right of the Lithuanian nation to self-determination. However, it is strange: Do they not really understand that one of these days their party will become a political corpse? But the processes of putrefaction that have started are not only unpleasant to the sense of smell, they also cause a lot of other troubles.

"Clearly realizing that the Lithuanian CPSU chose its own destiny, we should also frankly look into the prospects for our own party. Is it that bright, even if we are staying in step with our own people? The aforementioned red flag syndrome does not permit us to think this; that is, to look optimistically on the future of an independent Lithuanian Communist Party. Therefore, I am convinced that there is a pressing need to unite our split ranks on behalf of Lithuania itself.

"To unite the split ranks of Communists—is this not utopia? Or perhaps a bad dream dreamt by a naive idealist?

"No, this is not utopia, nor is it gibberish. Lithuania needs this and we can do it," writes Albinas Visockas, and he tries to prove this in his open letter.

Lithuanian Delegates for USSR Negotiations Meet

LD2609220390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] A meeting of the state delegation of the Republic of Lithuania for the negotiations with the Soviet Union was held today at the building of the Supreme Council. The meeting was chaired by the head of the delegation, Chairman of the Supreme Council Vytautas Landsbergis. The meeting was attended by the members of the delegation: Aleksandras Abisalas, Pranas Kuris, Romualdas Ozolas, Kazimiera Prunskiene, Algirdas Saudargas, Ceslovas Stankevicius, and Emanuelis Zingeris, as well as the chairman of the commission for political, legal and diplomatic preparations Bronislovas Kuzmickas.

Problems concerning the structure of experts, advisers and technical services taking part in the work of the delegation, and organizational questions were discussed. Regulations of the delegation's work were adopted. Aleksandras Abisalas was appointed coordinator of the delegation.

The delegation discussed and determined its general attitude to some principal questions concerning the beginning of the negotiations.

Lithuanian Memorandum Issued on CSCE Talks

90UN2831B Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian
5 Sep 90 p 1

[Unattributed article: "Memorandum Disseminated"]

[Text] The Lithuanian Republic Ministry of Foreign Affairs has disseminated a memorandum on the participation of Lithuania in the CSCE. The document, which was transmitted through diplomatic channels to governments participating in the conference, notes that "the independence of the Lithuanian Republic, which was restored by an Act of the Supreme Council of 11 March and which expresses the sovereign will of the Lithuanian people, has created conditions in Lithuania to return as a full member to the world and EC from which it was illegally excluded at the time of World War II. This act embodies the inalienable right of the people to self-determination, which creates the basis for the cooperation of peoples and which is solemnly affirmed in the Helsinki CSCE Final Act, and also in acts of subsequent conferences, including the final document of the Vienna meeting.

"The Lithuanian Republic, taking the basic principles of security and cooperation in Europe into account, expresses its readiness to fulfill all obligations that issue from them, and it is also ready to enjoy all of the rights of a European state. Despite this, Lithuania and the neighboring states of Estonia and Latvia—victims of aggression, occupation, and annexation—are not permitted to take part in the process of security and cooperation in Europe which clearly contradicts the principles contained in the Helsinki CSCE Final Act."

The memorandum emphasizes that the states that are directly responsible for the aggression against the Lithuanian Republic are obliged to take all possible steps necessary to restore the violated rights of Lithuania—a sovereign European state. The Baltic states, as subjects of international law, and taking into account the provisions of Article 54 of the final recommendations of the Helsinki conference, demand the status of observer in the preparatory committee for the CSCE meeting. The granting of such a right cannot infringe upon the legal interests of other European states. The people of Lithuania are paying particular attention to this question, and they will assess the results of the CSCE, taking the resolution of this problem into account.

Lithuania Examines Two-Plus-Four Talks

90UN2831A Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 4 Sep 90 p 1

[ELTA report: "We Will Express Our Will"]

[Text] "For Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, World War II has not ended," it was established at a congress of parties, political organizations, and movements of the republic held Saturday. Its participants, who represent several dozens organizations, were talking about the "Two-Plus-Four" meeting to be held on 12 September in Moscow. At the meeting, the great powers and the two Germanys will consider questions concerning the unification of the latter—in this way it is planned to eliminate the consequences of World War II.

Representatives who spoke at the conference noted that the meeting in Moscow is a special event. In addition to the problem of German unification, the future of the Baltic republics can be considered and decided. But this should not be done without the participation of authorized representatives of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, as happened in 1975 at Helsinki. The question of Baltic states occupied by the Soviet Union cannot be suppressed and remain an "internal problem" of the USSR.

Representatives of the political organizations decided to call on the inhabitants of Lithuania and those of Lithuanian extraction throughout the world to take part in various actions and to direct the attention of governments and the world community to the unresolved problems of the Baltic states. It is planned to coordinate measures among the three Baltic republics and emigrants from these states.

Export of Goods Restricted in Lithuania

LD2609105590 Moscow World Service in Russian 1900 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] The Lithuanian Government has adopted a decision on additional temporary measures to protect the republic's market; a similar document is being discussed in the national parliament. Profiteering in Lithuania is on a huge scale: goods and foodstuffs are smuggled out by foreign tourists and inhabitants of the republic going on trips abroad. Some local enterprises themselves sell their output on the market at speculative prices. It is therefore planned from 1 October to entrust the economic protection of the borders to the Lithuanian customs and restrict the export of goods.

Lithuania's Saudargas Plans U.S. Visit

LD2609210290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] The Republic's Foreign Minister Algirdas Saudargas will visit the United States from 29 September to 8 October. The aim of his visit is to raise at the conference of 35 European and North American foreign ministers on 1-2 October the question of the participation of the Baltic states—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—in the CSCE.

RSFSR

Communist Party Draft Action Program

90UN2807A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Aug 90 pp 1, 2

["Draft Action Program of the Communist Party of the RSFSR"]

[Text]

Comrade Communists, Working People of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]!

The draft Action Program of the Communist Party of the RSFSR published below was prepared on the basis of the program statement and rules of the CPSU and other documents of the 28th CPSU Congress and in development of their ideas. It accumulates the opinions of the delegates to the 28th party congress and the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR and numerous proposals of the party organizations and the Communists.

The draft was drawn up by the Preparatory Committee in whose working groups members of the Central Committees of the CPSU and the Communist Party of the RSFSR, delegates to the 28th party congress, representatives of the "Communists of Russia" group of deputies of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, the Initiating Congress of Communists of Russia, the Democratic Platform in the CPSU Reform Communists Section, the

Marxist Platform in the CPSU, and of the scientific and artistic intelligentsia participated.

The proposed draft Action Program of the RSFSR's Communists is to be discussed comprehensively and in depth in the party organizations, and its content is to be enriched with regard for the positions, views, and approaches of the workers, peasants, intelligentsia, servicemen, women, youth, and veterans and, with regard for their proposals, is to be examined at the second stage of the Constituent Congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR.

The proposed draft was approved in the main at a meeting of members of the Communist Party of the RSFSR Central Committee.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR is coming into being under most complex conditions. The republic like the whole country is experiencing a profound economic, political, and spiritual crisis brought on by the long domination of the administrative-command system.

The revolutionary renewal of society has run into unprecedented problems and a sharp exacerbation of accumulated contradictions and difficulties. This has to a considerable extent been the result also of the miscalculations and mistakes in the course of perestroyka itself. Many of its practical steps have not been based on a scientifically substantiated program, have been inconsistent, and have left in the background the socialist essence and thrust of perestroyka. Anti-socialist and anti-Communist movements which have arisen have fallen into step with it.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR represents a most important internation detachment composed of the Communists of 130 nationalities. It is an inalienable part of the CPSU and operates in accordance with its program documents and rules.

At the same time, however, the Communist Party of the RSFSR deems it expedient to also have its own action program conditioned by the specifics and actual singularities of the Russian Federation.

In the Socioeconomic Sphere

The Communists of the Russian Federation consider as the principal goal of the immediate period a stabilization of the people's living standard and subsequently a rise in the standard based on the conscious labor of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia and the efficient use of the economic and intellectual potential and the wealth of the republic's raw material resources.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR supports and will uphold the **socialist thrust of the transition to a controlled market economy and will consistently implement the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress on the transformation of property relations and the equal development of its diverse forms precluding man's exploitation of man.**

Supplement of the Marxist Platform and Initiating Congress of the Communists of Russia Organizing Bureau

The Communists of the republic consider impermissible the arbitrary imposition of any forms of ownership and the total denationalization of state property for which a number of political parties active in Russia are calling. Nor will attempts to reanimate private capitalist ownership under the cover of an appeal for a diversity of forms of ownership find support among the Communists.

The fundamental position of Russia's Communists consists of the need to preserve socialism's leading position in the economic structure in renewal of state ownership of the means of production.

The Communists are sure that democratically transformed forms of management based on state ownership will demonstrate their high efficiency, receptivity to the latest achievements of world scientific and technical progress, and a capacity for realizing man's economic interests.

We are for the formation of an effective and flexible mechanism of state administration providing, together with legal and financial and credit regulators, for the active use of planning and its fundamental restructuring and democratization and the conversion of the work force in practice into an independent creator of the plans. Planning must not lose its role in the determination of the goals, priorities, and reference points of the comprehensive development of the economy of the republic and its national-state, national-territorial, and administrative-territorial formations.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR intends to use all propaganda media to explain the need for economic reform and its prospects, overcome prejudice against the market, and combat dependent sentiments.

Supplement of the Marxist Platform and Initiating Congress of the Communists of Russia Organizing Bureau

The Communists must not allow transition to the market to legitimize social injustice. They will resist the imposition of a private capital market leading to unearned income from capital and the sale of stock to persons who are not members of labor collectives and also the creation of a wage-labor manpower market which would make mass unemployment inevitable.

We consider impermissible the introduction of free prices under conditions of the imbalance in the economy which could lead to increased inflation and exacerbation of the economic crisis.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR considers a paramount task of its policy to be the **establishment of social justice and the authority of honest, conscientious labor.** The Communists of the Russian Federation will conduct

an uncompromising struggle against the growing property and social stratification of the population on an unearned basis.

The party will seek **official guarantees for the working people in the sphere of employment,** accessibility to professional training and retraining, and the necessary level of material sufficiency for a period of temporary unemployment; and will emphatically advocate material sufficiency and social benefits primarily for invalids, retirees, large families, and other inadequately protected strata of the population, and a strengthening of the social safeguards for employees living in areas of the Far North, Siberia, and the Far East.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR **is for the real economic independence of the Russian Federation, the development of self-government** at all levels and the broad rights and full responsibility of the soviets of people's deputies in the solution of questions of vital importance. We consider expedient the creation of a special republic fund for equalizing the economic and social development of the regions.

Russia's Communists support an accelerated **increase in the production of consumer goods and the provision of public services based** on structural changes in the economy, an expansion in the economy of the share of the consumer sectors, the conversion of defense industry, and **a sharp increase in the extent of housing construction** thanks to a redistribution of financial and material and technical resources from the production sphere into the housing sphere and the use of resources of enterprises, public organizations, and individuals' personal savings.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR is for broadening the assistance of the state and the local soviets in the provision of housing for invalids, war and labor veterans, families of those who have died in performance of their duty, and families of servicemen, and also for teachers, doctors, people working in science and culture, large families, and residents moved from the zone affected by the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will contribute to the extensive and equal **participation of the republic's economy in the international division of labor and the pooling of labor,** its incorporation in the world market, the creation of joint ventures, the formation of open economic zones and the development of the direct international relations of all commodity producers, given assurance of the interests and legitimate rights of the population of the republic.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR believes that it is essential, together with the accomplishment of long-term goals, **to immediately devise and implement urgent anti-crisis measures** which will make it possible to create economic conditions conducive to the transition to the normal functioning of the consumer goods, services, and producer goods market.

Position on This Issue of the Marxist Platform and the Initiating Congress of the Communists of Russia Organizing Bureau

Together with the directions for surmounting the state republic budget deficit envisaged by the government and proceeding from world practice, it is essential:

to establish financial control over revenue incorporating the introduction of single personal accounts in the savings bank and the submittal of statements of income in excess of 10,000 rubles [R] a year and increased liability for the distortion of income information;

to eliminate a substantial proportion of the surplus money supply by way of monetary reform aimed against the shadow economy and unearned income;

to introduce a progressive inheritance tax;

to close off channels for "pumping" money from the noncash to the cash sphere;

to restore and tighten for an emergency period wholesale and retail price control, including the establishment of maximum prices for cooperative and market trade. To use for such control all resources available to the state and public organizations.

Restructuring in the economy must not lead to the replacement of one "elite" stratum—the voluntarist-bureaucratic apparatus—by another whose power is based on the strength of private capital. The social base of perestroyka are those who live by their labor. We are for an uncompromising struggle against the ongoing property and social stratification of the population on an unearned basis.

The result of perestroyka should be a growth in the living standard of all working people, not the intensifying property and social polarization of society.

Alternative Version of the Preceding Part of the "In the Socioeconomic Sphere" Section of the Democratic Platform in the CPSU Reform Communists Section *The Communist Party of the RSFSR supports the transition being effected in the country and the republic toward a controlled market economy. The Communists will seek to ensure that the state guarantee during this transition:*

a set of measures preventing a lowering of the living standard of all categories of the population and making it possible in the future to achieve a rise in the living standard;

an effective mechanism for protection of the working people in the sphere of employment, including a system of vocational training and retraining, conditions for the migration of manpower, and a guaranteed level of support for a period of retraining or temporary unemployment;

protection of the interests of the needy categories of the population, including a guaranteed subsistence minimum.

The Communist Party advocates the equal development and functioning of various forms of ownership and will counter the directive imposition of the priority of any of them.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will contribute to practical measures pertaining to the introduction of market relations. Its organizations and bodies do not intend direct leadership of the economy. However, the tempo and ultimate success of the emergence from the crisis will depend on the Communists to a considerable extent. The party intends to use its propaganda potential to explain the need for economic reform and its prospects, to overcome the prejudice against the market and to combat the dependent sentiments which have deeply penetrated all strata of society.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will actively formulate a modern socioeconomic policy and implement it through the Communists working in production and in the organs of people's power and economic administration; and will examine, study, and devise alternative versions of economic decisions. We consider it essential to conduct wide-ranging public discussion, in the party included on the proposed draft programs of transition to the market. **We will insist on their adoption by public referendum.**

On agrarian reform the Communist Party of the RSFSR will **seek a fundamental improvement in the socioeconomic position of rural inhabitants.**

The Communist Party of the RSFSR and the "Communists of Russia" group of deputies will participate actively in the elaboration of bills on land, leasing, and tenant relations in the RSFSR; the principles of economic relations between town and country; social protection and protection of the health of the rural population; the development of consumer cooperatives; and on other issues. Our goal is **the elaboration and fulfillment of an official program for the social restructuring of the countryside, primarily the Non-Chernozem region, the North, Siberia and the Far East.** The supply of gas and power and the building of motor roads in rural localities should be undertaken by the state, in the main.

We support the **multistructural** nature of the rural economy and the right of the peasants themselves to determine the forms of organization of production, and **equal economic relations** for the collective and state farms, cooperatives and peasant farms. We will seek to ensure that the peasant always be the master of his labor and to contribute to the development of the peasant farmsteads and orchard-truck garden cooperatives and the allotment of land to all who are capable of making efficient use of it for food production. The participation of the work force of the cities and industrial centers in rendering the countryside diverse assistance is a vital necessity at the present time.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR supports the aims and tasks of the RSFSR Agrarian Union, calls upon all Communists to cooperate closely with its bodies locally and contribute to the defense of the interests of the peasants and the development of the entire agro-industrial complex, and believes that economic relations between industry and agricultural production should be built on an equivalent basis.

In environmental protection activity. It is the moral and political duty of the Communists to participate actively in the movement for the rational **use and restoration of the natural resources of the Russian Federation** and the creation of a pleasant environment for man.

We support a fundamental updating of ecological legislation, the elaboration of an economic mechanism for the use of nature, and the introduction of public expert appraisal of industrial engineering projects.

The Communist Party supports the Union-republic program of **eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl catastrophe** in Bryansk, Kaluga, Orel, Ryazan, Smolensk, Tula, Kursk, Lipetsk, Belgorod, Voronezh, and other oblasts.

The Communists will participate actively in the realization of RSFSR Government measures pertaining to a recovery of the ecological situation in the Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic; in the Urals; in the Kuzbass; in the area of the Kursk Magnetic Anomaly; the Volga, Ob and Amur river basins; Lakes Ladoga and Baykal; the Black, Caspian, and Baltic Seas; and the regions where the small peoples of the North live.

In the Sphere of Culture, Science, and Education

An upsurge of culture and concern for the moral health of the people and the realization of the republic's intellectual potential in the interests of all its citizens will be priority areas of the policy of the Communist Party of the RSFSR.

The party organizations will do everything possible for the development of the distinctive, multinational culture and folk art; the preservation and restoration of the historical and cultural monuments of all peoples of the Russian Federation; and the development of book publishing.

We are for freedom of creativity, a solicitous attitude toward talent, and the utmost moral and material support for it. The Communist Party intends to establish special funds, prizes, and scholarships to stimulate the development of culture, art, and science and the formation of young talent.

The Communists will make a specific contribution to the elaboration and realization of programs of the social and cultural **revival of small towns and villages** and an increase in the cultural potential primarily of the Non-Chernozem area, Siberia, and the Far East. We will contribute to the creation of cultural and national centers and societies for the spiritual mutual enrichment of the cultures of all peoples, given a particularly solicitous attitude toward the culture, language, and social life of the small peoples of the RSFSR.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will participate in shaping the scientific policy in the republic; champion the democratization of scientific activity and the surmounting of the disconnectedness of academy, higher educational institution, sectoral, and plant science; and defend science against all forms of diktat and support the protection of copyright and intellectual property. It will support the re-formation of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

We are for a fundamental improvement in the Union and international scientific and technical relations of the RSFSR for the purpose of increasing domestic scientific potential.

The Communists of the RSFSR support **the strengthening of the republic's sovereignty in the sphere of public education** and its ties to sources of national culture, development of the national school, and a broadening of the independence and the extensive use of various types of educational institutions.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR advocates the priority financing of culture, science, and education from republic and local budgets and the attraction of the resources of enterprises; cooperatives; and public, charitable, and other foundations; and also the use of the material resources of the CPSU to this end.

The Communists intend **to strive for an enhancement of the prestige of the profession of culture employee, scientist, and teacher;** an improvement in the conditions of their work and everyday life; fair remuneration in teaching, scientific, and cultural activity; the social protection of people working in the intellectual sphere; and the surmounting of the emerging trend toward a "brain drain" from the country.

The Communist Party will present to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet an initiative pertaining to the preparation and enactment of laws on public education, science, international scientific and technical relations, cultural policy in the Russian Federation, the artistic unions, and an All-Russia Cultural Foundation. The Communists are emphatically **opposed to the commercialization of culture and art and the implantation of anti-culture** leading to spiritual devastation and the moral destruction of the personality.

In the Political Sphere

The Communists **support the development of the RSFSR as a sovereign state based on the rule of law—an inalienable part of the USSR.** They reject the counterposing of the republic's laws to all-Union laws and **support the sovereignty of the soviets and close cooperation with them.**

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will struggle on a democratic basis for the Communists' extensive representation in the soviets and the formation in them and in the public organizations of party groups (factions) which will present legislative initiatives, undertake the expert appraisal of draft legislative documents, and propose alternative versions. Where members of the CPSU are in a minority they will perform the role of constructive opposition, supporting decisions which correspond to the needs and interests of the people. The Communists of the Russian Federation are prepared for partnership and the coordination of joint action in the soviets with other parties and movements within the framework of the RSFSR Constitution. We are opposed to the conversion of the soviets into an arena for settling political scores, satisfying ambitions and small-group interests, and displaying social demagogy. In such situations the Communists will sponsor public actions and protest campaigns and the recall of individual deputies who have failed to justify the people's trust, or the early dissolution of the soviet and the scheduling of new elections.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will submit for consideration by the highest organs of legislative power of the republic proposals pertaining to the elaboration and adoption of the following political documents: on basic principles of the elaboration of the RSFSR Constitution; public referendums on most important issues of the socioeconomic and social and political life of the RSFSR; the RSFSR Constitutional Court; a system of local self-government in the RSFSR; judicial and legal reform; the RSFSR Procuracy; state supervision in the RSFSR; and the mechanism of the republic's foreign economic activity. Most important bills will be preliminarily discussed in the party organizations and at plenums of the Communist Party of the RSFSR Central Committee.

The Communist Party of the Russian Federation proposes a reform of the electoral system which would make it possible to facilitate the process of nominating candidates for people's deputy from the population according to the place of residence and ensure representation in the soviets of emissaries of the labor collectives.

Version of the Initiating Congress of the Communists of Russia Organizing Bureau

The Communist Party of the RSFSR proposes a reform of the electoral system providing for elections of people's deputies of all levels by production and territorial district.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR **considers inexpedient a separation of the functions of the chairmen of the local soviets and their executive committees** and advocates the reconsideration of this proposition.

We will **support new forms of people's power arising at the initiative of the working people:** work force councils, workers committees, local self-government soviets, and voter clubs and associations; and operate in them actively and seek the legal enshrinement of the powers of the self-government authorities as being closest to the real life of the people.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR **is for consistent democratic supervision of the execution of laws and decisions of the higher and local organs of state and administration.** The Communists will struggle against sloppiness, remiss management, and permissiveness and for the establishment of strong discipline, legality, and law and order. We are for the elaboration, adoption, and commissioning as quickly as possible of a **republic program for fighting crime and for the legal education of the population.**

The party organizations are called upon **to pay paramount attention to the rights and freedoms of the individual** and to oppose all forms of persecution of people for their views, beliefs, and national origins and the demeaning of a person's honor and dignity. The party will sponsor the elaboration of a concept of defense of human rights activity in the republic and the creation of a Center for Human Rights.

The Communists **support progressive changes in the trade union movement** and will cooperate with it in defense of the working people's rights and interests.

The Communists attach particular significance **to participation in the reviving worker and peasant movement** in the name of social justice, democracy, and socialism.

The Communists support the legislative initiative of the Russian Komsomol [Communist Youth League] pertaining to a solution of the main **youth problems,** primarily the assurance of social protection and equal opportunities for all social groups of the youth.

We are interested in the Komsomol's active participation in the elaboration and implementation of the party's youth policy and regard it as a political ally, interaction with which will be organized on the principles of equality and close cooperation, and on a common ideological basis. The Communists will contribute in every possible way to the consistent rejuvenation of personnel in all spheres of public and state life.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR **is for active cooperation with the women's movement.** It advocates women being accorded the right of free choice of their social role and women's participation in the adoption and implementation of decisions at all levels and their extensive representation in the state and public authorities; and will contribute in every possible way to the realization of an official program to improve the position of women and the family and protect mother and child. The Communists support the women's "For a Socialist Future for Our Children" movement.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will in every possible way **protect the interests of the older generations** of Soviet people, display concern for the creation for veterans of decent living conditions, and look for their support in the struggle for perestroyka.

Communists intend to build anew their relations **with believers.** While keeping to positions of the materialist world outlook, we are prepared in conjunction with believers to channel efforts into the spiritual and cultural elevation of the peoples of Russia.

Under the conditions of a multiparty system which actually exists, the Communist Party of the RSFSR will interact vigorously with other public forces advocating the socialist development path. We do not rule out the possibility of creating an electoral bloc of the "left" and other forms of joint work. We propose to all political parties, movements, and organizations the joint discussion of questions of civic accord and an anti-crisis program.

The Communists will by political methods **rebuff all who encroach on the socialist system** and will struggle for the application of the law against those who preach racial or national exclusiveness and violence and incite distrust and hatred between peoples and social groups, specifically, Russophobia, Zionism, and anti-Semitism.

While recognizing the exclusive right of the USSR to the organizational development, training, and use of the country's armed forces strictly in accordance with Union legislation, the Communist Party of the RSFSR deems it necessary to participate actively in the formulation and realization of military reform and conversion with regard for the interests of the Russian Federation. The Communists **are for a strengthening of the Armed Forces' ties to the civilian part of society, an improvement in the life of Army and Navy outfits,** open criticism of the shortcomings there, assistance in overcoming them and opposition to the disinformation about and slander of the Army. The Communists emphatically reject the demands for depoliticization and the removal of party organizations from the Armed Forces, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and KGB authorities, the procuracy and the courts, and also from the system of state administration.

The Communist Party advocates the utmost concern for servicemen released into the reserve upon a reduction in the Armed Forces, and also employees of the defense sectors released in the course of conversion, and will strive for the fulfillment of an official program of social security for servicemen and members of their families.

In the Sphere of Nationality Policy

The Communist Party of the RSFSR advocates the speediest conclusion of a new Union treaty. **We confirm our adherence to the idea of the voluntary Union and preservation of the integrity of the USSR** as an association of free and equal republics and consider expedient the conclusion of direct treaties between the republics on the principles of equality and mutual benefit.

The Communists are for the RSFSR becoming a sovereign federation of free peoples and **consider the priority task to be the formulation of a draft Republic Treaty** within whose framework each people might independently choose the form of their statehood and the rights

of all autonomous entities would be expanded appreciably and would be realized in practice. The autonomous republics, oblastsm, and okrugs should be equal subjects of the Russian Federation.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR is profoundly concerned for the fate of the small peoples and the growing threat of the disappearance of their traditional way of life, economic activity, culture, and language. It will seek the representation in the highest organs of power of the republic not only of the autonomous entities but also of peoples which are without their own statehood. The Communists will take similar steps at the autonomous republic, kray, and oblast level. **We will present an initiative pertaining to the elaboration of an all-republic program of measures reflecting the legitimate interests of the small peoples and the restoration of the rights of the peoples which were illegally punished in the 1930's-1940's.**

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will do everything to ensure that the state guarantee in full for a person of any nationality, regardless of his place of abode, the exercise of his constitutional rights and liberties. We consider unlawful the attempts to legitimize the priority status of the indigenous nation leading to a violation of human rights and the stoking of interethnic friction. Nor can we agree with the use of slogans of national revival to kindle interethnic conflicts.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR will **insist on the most urgent and all-embracing measures to protect the life, property, and civil rights of the representatives of peoples of the republics** living in zones of interethnic conflict in other Union republics or who have found themselves in the position of refugees to full compensation for the losses they have incurred. We propose the creation at the state level of a refugee committee and the **establishment of a refugee assistance fund.** Russia remains sympathetic to the misfortunes of each person who has fallen victim to nationalist extremism and has been forced to seek refuge in our republic. **We are for a high standard of interethnic communication and internationalism.**

We **call on our compatriots overseas** and patriots of Russia to participate to the best of their abilities in the processes of perestroyka being accomplished in our common homeland.

Ideological Activity

The Communist Party of the RSFSR **considers a priority task** in the sphere of theory the **elaboration of a modern concept of socialism** based on a creative approach to the heritage of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and their associates and followers; a critical interpretation of the historical experience of socialism; and a scientific analysis of contemporary world development and the achievements of progressive social thought. **We will champion and realize socialist ideas and orient ourselves toward the communist perspective.**

Communists do not lay claim to a monopoly of their ideology but consider it necessary to do everything to ensure that each person with an interest in its scientific principles may obtain the pertinent information without hindrance. It is planned to create under the auspices of organizations and committees of the Communist Party of the RSFSR clubs, lecture halls, and courses open to all; to restore the traditions of propaganda, canvassing, and explanatory work in the work force and at the place of residence; and to channel it into the shaping of the working people's conscious attitude toward the accomplishment of tasks pertaining to surmounting the crisis.

The party will create research and training centers and a system for the study of public opinion and will enlist intellectual forces capable of making a precise analysis of the situation and forecasting its development. We **are for extensive cooperation with the artistic and scientific intelligentsia** and will do everything to ensure that the best minds of the RSFSR support the party's undertakings.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR does not reject practical, constructive criticism on the part of any opponents. At the same time, however, it will actively counter anti-communism and ideologically rebuff anti-socialist forces. The Communists will **struggle resolutely against desecration of the memory of Marx, Engels, Lenin,** and other outstanding figures of the Russian and international workers movement and against disparagement of their theories and personalities.

Our task **is to develop propaganda of humanitarian values** like collectivism, industriousness, mutual tolerance, respect for one's elders, decency, and charity.

In developing international relations and organizing foreign policy information the Communist Party of the RSFSR will conduct a wide-ranging dialogue with overseas Communist, socialist, social democratic, and other parties and movements, and will contribute in every possible way to the creation of a correct idea overseas of the Russian and other peoples of the RSFSR and their history, culture, and problems of past and present.

Operating in accordance with the USSR Press Act, the Communist Party of the RSFSR will pay **particular attention to the implementation of an effective information policy** aimed at shaping the renewed consciousness of the masses and the consolidation of the Communists and their allies in the business of perestroyka.

The Communists will aspire to ensure that their positions be objectively reflected in the press belonging to the state authorities and public organizations. The Communist Party of the RSFSR intends to strengthen its own party system of mass media: to create its own publishing houses, newspapers, and journals and to seek the establishment of radio and television channels. Press centers and press groups will operate under the auspices of the Communist Party of the RSFSR Central Committee and the local party committees.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR intends **to stimulate the search for new forms of editorial-publishing and economic activity** and encourage the creation of joint ventures and joint-stock companies and print publications on co-founding terms with the soviets and public organizations and movements sharing the program goals of the CPSU.

The Communist Party has an interest in journalists' participation in its elective bodies and will promote their professional growth and an improvement in their work and everyday conditions. The mutual relations of the party committees and press party authorities will be built on the principles of trust and comradeship, equality, and cooperation.

Internal Party Life

Communists of the Russian Federation regard the creation of their own party not as a mechanical act of the merger of the party organizations of the republic but as the **emergence of a new political force. Endeavoring to win vanguard positions** in society, the Communist Party of the RSFSR will increase the ideological and moral steadfastness, unity, discipline and selflessness, and disinterest of the Communists, decisively renew and democratize party life, establish the power of the party masses, and work selflessly in the name of the interests of the working people and peoples of the RSFSR.

We **are opposed to dogmatic and liquidationist sentiments in the party** and support a purge of the party ranks of those who compromise it by their behavior and who have in fact gone over to positions which are alien to it.

The principal preoccupation is an influx into the party of fresh forces, primarily working people, the youth, and active supporters of perestroyka.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR intends to introduce in the party's elective bodies quotas for women in proportion to their numbers in the party; and to create in the party authorities special commissions for work among women.

The party will pay particular **attention to a broadening of the rights and an increase in the assertiveness and independence of its primary party organizations.** They are called upon to find forms and methods of work which enable them under the new conditions not only to preserve but also to increase their influence in the work force. **The main thing for the Communists is defense of the working people's interests.** Having abandoned command methods, the party organizations must offer the work force programs for the solution of urgent social and economic problems and participate actively in their realization; and respond promptly to the sentiments and requirements of the working people and display flexibility and initiative in staging political actions.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR considers illegitimate and unconstitutional the demands for the removal of its organizations from the production outfits.

The Communist Party of the republic will strengthen its organizations considerably according to the place of residence and redistribute the Communists' forces so as to ensure that each territorial cell is capable of engaging in energetic propaganda and organizing activity, particularly in the period of an election struggle. It is their job to seek an improvement in people's living conditions. We are planning to create territorial cultural and social and political centers for work with the population according to the place of residence.

The Communists intend **to democratize the life of their primary organizations in every possible way,** to create in them every opportunity for comradely contacts and freedom of opinion and criticism. Communists who are in a minority on one issue or another are obliged to fulfill the adopted decisions, reserving here the right to express and uphold their opinion; they are guaranteed an opportunity to explain their views, including through the media. Communists who have different viewpoints on the ways of achieving common program goals may unite around the pertinent platforms.

The party organizations will defend the Communists against all forms of injustice and discrimination for their beliefs and membership in the CPSU and will render party comrades moral and material support. In turn, each Communist should be responsible for the fate and authority of his party organization and the whole party.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR and its bodies locally will render primary party organization secretaries at the forward edge of the political struggle the necessary support and assistance. **An All-Russia Primary Party Organization Secretary Council will be formed under the auspices of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the RSFSR.**

The party will support the development of horizontal structures—secretary councils, party clubs, and such—and the unification of party committees' efforts in the solution of regional and interregional problems.

Under the new conditions the party intends to develop its own production and economic activity. The structure and list of personnel of the party committees will be brought into line with their new functions and work conditions.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR views as unwarranted and illegal the demands for the nationalization of party property.

The republic Communist Party supports an enhancement of the status and a broadening of the rights and independence of the party committees of the national-territorial formations of the RSFSR.

It will perform active and purposeful personnel work; undertake the training of a reserve; recommend to the organs of state power and administration the best-suited Communists and nonparty persons; make its evaluation

of people working in the state and economic authorities; and oppose bureaucratism, protectionism, and incompetence.

It is necessary to renew the party personnel and replenish its ranks with energetic people capable of thinking and acting in the new way. To extensively enlist in work in the party authorities professional ideologists: philosophers, economists, political scientists, sociologists, and other specialists. Activity in the apparatus will be wholly under the supervision of the elective authorities and will be concentrated on the fulfillment of their decisions. * * *

Our goal is to ensure a socialist future for the country in the name of the working man and his social protection, well-being, and spiritual development and in the name of social justice and the establishment of the genuine power of the people.

The time has come for active work.

The Communist Party of the RSFSR calls on Communists and all to whom the ideals of October and our socialist fatherland are dear to join vigorously with full effort, knowledge, and ability in work on the implementation of this Action Program. * * *

The proposed document is a reference point for the formulation by party organizations of all levels of specific action programs taking account of local conditions and the interests of the working people.

Interregional Deputies Group Discusses Draft Laws

LD2609210690 Moscow TASS in English 1943 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Agabekov and Igor Gvritishvili]

[Text] Moscow September 26 TASS—The inter-regional group of deputies today met for an enlarged session involving the Democratic Russia bloc in the building of the Moscow City Council to discuss the draft documents "On elaborating a plan for the transition to a market economy", "On the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet" and "On additional powers of the USSR president".

The drafts express unsatisfaction with the inefficient work of the Soviet parliament in adopting decisions that are vital to the country and its refusal to base the transition to a market economy of the Gorbachev-Yeltsin plan.

Concerning the newly-adopted law "On additional measures to stabilise economic and socio-political life in the country", the drafts note that only those spheres of the presidential power could be strengthened, on which the agreement of the majority of union republics was reached. Simultaneously, it is emphasised that it is impossible to define the areas of the expanded presidential powers before a plan of transformations is adopted.

All three drafts were presented to deputies by Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov. After the drafts were discussed, it was decided to send them for further study to the coordinating councils of the inter-regional group of deputies and the Democratic Russia bloc, which will meet on Thursday.

Economic Independence Conference Held in Ulan-Ude

LD2609010490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] An all-Russian scientific and practical conference which has opened in Ulan-Ude is devoted to the problems of the economic independence of the Russian Federation and autonomous republics. Representatives of governments, party and soviet workers of autonomous formations, specialists of the national scientific centers of Russia, and people's deputies of the USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republics are taking part in its work. The contradictions which are facing the autonomous republics on the eve of the transfer to the market economy are at the center of attention of the participants in the conference. The history of the autonomous republics, krays, oblasts, and national okrugs has a lot in common. Today they, together with Russia, are living through a difficult process of renewal and are looking for ways to solve economic, ecological, and moral problems. That is why one of the objectives of the conference is to draw up a single program of actions, specific measures in connection with the establishment of sovereignty and economic independence of the autonomous formations within the Union and Russia.

Dzasokhov Holds Exchange of Views in Penza Oblast

LD2609221690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] At the present time Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and secretary, is in Penza Oblast.

The agenda for his stay includes familiarization with the oblast party organization work experience in fulfilling the 28th CPSU Congress decisions, meetings in industrial and rural labor collectives and culture establishments, and the study of the real public moods on the eve of the party's Central Committee plenum.

In his conversations, questions on raising the CPSU's authority as well as renewing activities of party organizations and interrelations between the party and the soviets were touched on.

During the exchange of view desires were expressed for the soonest possible stabilization of economic and political life in the country.

Prokofyev Comments on Moscow Food Shortages

LD2609182190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] The situation in Moscow is explosive. This conclusion can be drawn from the discussion held at the bureau of the Moscow City CPSU Committee today. Its participants spoke with alarm about the absence of consumer goods, construction bottlenecks, and the extraordinary situation with regard to supplies of foodstuffs to the capital. There is probably not a single sphere of the city's life which does not give rise to the most serious thoughts and very profound alarm.

Speaking at the bureau, Prokofyev, member of the Politburo and first secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee, stressed that the stabilization of the situation in Moscow is probably the city party organization's most important political task today.

Talking about specific plans, support was given in particular to a proposal that each Communist should spend not less than three days working in the fields of the Moscow region.

Coverage of 31 Aug Leningrad Obkom Plenum

Report on Plenum

90UN2815A Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Aug 90 p 1

[LENTASS report published under the rubric "Plenum of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom": "On the Threshold of a Socialist Market"; followed by comments by correspondent A. Ozhegov's: "Center Right or Center Left?"]

[Text] The results of the 28th CPSU Congress and the political position and program of the oblast party committee [obkom] were discussed at an enlarged obkom plenum that was held yesterday. A report was delivered by B.V. Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the obkom.

Following detailed discussion, the draft obkom political position and program was adopted. It says the main result of the 28th CPSU Congress was the prevention of a split in the party at a time when a united CPSU can and must be a real force capable of confronting the destructive processes leading to chaos, and ultimately to a disintegration of the CPSU. However, the congress left open the question of the party's strategy and tactics and its program actions under the conditions of the transition to a market economy. The Leningrad Obkom considers necessary the convening of a CPSU Central Committee Plenum devoted to the party's formulation of its concept of the market.

However, this will require recognition of a new role for the CPSU. It should occupy, in relation to the state, the position of a party of political criticism and constructive opposition in cases where offical policy conflicts with the interests of the working people.

The plenum considered the nominations for executive bodies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party.

The question of the information activity of the Leningrad party organization was studied.

The adopted decision approved the programs of activity and statutes of the newspapers LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA and LENINGRADSKIY RABOCHIY. It was decided to establish NOVYY ZHURNAL—a social and political publication of the obkom.

O.S. Kuzin, who was previously head of the obkom Ideology Department, was elected on a multiple-choice basis as chief editor of the newspaper LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA.

Organizational matters were considered.

Today we publish the comments of our correspondent from the obkom plenum.

Center Right or Center Left

I emphatically disagree with the comrades from the "Democratic Platform" movement who from time to time skeptically grumble: There will be little change in the party since it was not the radical democrats—the "center left"—but merely the moderate reform liberals from the party leadership who gained the ascendancy at the 28th CPSU Congress. This, among other things, was declared at yesterday's obkom plenum by Yu.M. Protasenko, an obkom member and researcher at the V.G. Khlopin Radium Institute. No fundamental, striking changes which are particularly noticeable for party members with a substantial length of service are occurring.

Was it conceivable earlier that among the top leaders of the CPSU there could have been not even one holding an executive position and office in state administration. Yet this remarkable fact has not been fully recognized. Stereotypes of public consciousness that serve as grounds for the "expanded" reproduction of dogmatic propositions and postulates like these, which set the teeth on edge: "the party decides everything" and "the CPSU will not give up power itself," which Obkom Secretary Yu.P. Belov spoke about at the plenum, still operate. He emphasized that the CPSU should now occupy, in respect of the legislative and executive authorities of the state, the position of a party of political criticism and constructive opposition where, naturally, official policy is contrary to the interests of the working people and infringes civil rights and liberties.

Just imagine: We are talking about the perfectly probable opposition of what is now the ruling party to the highest organs of state power! To what extent is such a situation possible under the conditions of a market economy? And what should the primary party organizations do under the conditions of the coming transformations?

It was the discussion of these issues that primarily determined the nature and content of the debate at the

Leningrad Obkom Plenum. Speakers took the floor one after the other—18 members of the obkom, delegates to the 28th congress, and invited comrades applied to speak—and, figuratively speaking, the pointer of the pendulum of the debate swung consistently now left, now right from the center if certain fundamental political propositions of the USSR president and his Presidential Council are considered such.

No speaker denied the fact that there is no alternative to the market. True, it seemed that some people were going along with this now "inspired" apothegm under constraint without any marked enthusiasm. It was only Yu.G. Terentyev, secretary of the "Avangard" Science-Production Association party committee and well known as a leader of the Initiating Congress for a Russian Communist Party in Leningrad, who candidly expressed his doubts.

"The market is not where the problem lies," he declared. "Can the cudgel of political compulsion be replaced by the economic cudgel in the interests of the working people? We need to develop the creative basis of the personality, creative energy."

"But how can this be done without the market?" I asked the party committee secretary during the break.

"Distribute according to labor," was the joking or serious answer of Terentyev who maintained that we are threatened by "a market of the era of savage capitalism" that will go down in history as a sinister memory, like the GULAG.

After such a statement, the pointer of the pendulum swung sharply in my view to the right, toward the beaten path of "victorious" stagnation. Yet just a little earlier it was these "gray" years that had been described by V.V. Gusev, secretary of the Sverdlov Association party committee and obkom member, as a time of struggle against "an invisible wall of bureaucratism," having bitterly ranked himself with the "generation of unrealized opportunities". He decisively opposed leveling in enterprise wage funds and advocated the effective stimulation of highly productive labor.

The pendulum of the debate occupied the once imaginary middle mark when A.M. Yelyashevich, delegate to the 28th congress and a leader of the "Center Left" informal association of Communists, spoke from the plenum's rostrum. True he compared the debate to a duel: Some people were pulling the country back, others—their rivals—forward. And he opposed both confrontation and opposition to the "center," the president of the country. A supposition of his that I wrote down in my notebook—"The social defense of the working people should be conducted not against the market but with its assistance"—would seem positive to me.

Indeed, it is possible to create such a defense that both the initiative of the entrepreneurs and commercial interest on the market would be "choked," but establishing commodity-money relations without them is simply impossible. Obviously obkom administrative affairs staff, which was a cofounder of the "Rossiya" commercial bank and which has already invested 15 million rubles [R] in its nominal capital—as B.V. Gidaspov, CPSU Central Committee secretary and obkom first secretary, informed the participants in the plenum—would soon be encountering this axiom also.

I do not believe that the commercial activity of the party committees might evoke a negative reaction from Leningrad's Communists as A.I. Bobrov, first secretary of the Dzerzhinskiy Rayon Party Committee [Raykom], fears in particular. On the contrary, the resources necessary for ensuring the social protection of party members, working people who have found themselves unemployed, and the needy, may be earned in this way upon transition to the market, V.N. Solovyev, radio regulator and obkom member, emphasized in his speech.

No, there is not as yet a script of transition to the market, or as G.S. Khizha, general director of "Svetlana," would say, an algorithm of the transition to commodity-money relations. True, there are approximately 30 market programs, but none of them was created in the CPSU Central Committee, it was said in the debate. The propositions, however, contained in the draft action program of the Russian Communist Party were sharply criticized by participants in the plenum. O.D. Cherezov, Kolpinskiy Raykom first secretary, and V.V. Kalashnikov, obkom bureau member, both delegates to the congress, rightly pointed out that in a number of its proposals this document of the RSFSR Communist Party contradicts the statements and decisions adopted at the 28th CPSU Congress. Obviously, lest this draft become a kind of "delayed-action bomb," it would appear to need to be discussed in advance in the primary party organizations.

There are differences, for example, on such a key point as determination of the social base of the CPSU. This is either all workers, peasants, and members of the intelligentsia adhering to progressive standpoints, or just those of them who are employed at enterprises of the state economy and are true to the socialist choice. And what this choice means specifically still has to be substantiated theoretically, observed A.V. Godunov, delegate to the party congress and a leader of the Democratic Platform. And we may most likely agree. How to make the CPSU a party of civil concord and the social protection of the working people if they have in advance been divided into "ours," and as it were "others." We refer obviously to those who will be employed in private property and the cooperatives. Will the boundary of ideological belief now run along sectors of the market economy?

Nonetheless mutual understanding, which was perhaps not left and not right of center but closer to the middle, was reached at the plenum. The draft Leningrad Obkom Political Position and Action Program, which will be published in our paper on the eve of the second stage of the RSFSR Communist Party Constituent Congress for

extensive discussion in the primary party organizations, were adopted by a huge majority—just two communists voted "against".

Gidaspov Issues Report

90UN2815B Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 31 Aug 90 pp 1-2

["From the speech by B.V. Gidaspov" at the Leningrad Obkom Plenum; published under the rubric "Plenum of the Leningrad CPSU Obkom": "On the Threshhold of a Socialist Market"]

[Text] Comrades!

The 28th CPSU Congress completed its business six weeks ago. Thinking about its results today, we have to evaluate the situation that is taking shape and determine our positions in the present difficult atmosphere.

The congress took place against a background of continuing intensification of the economic crisis, growth of social tension in the country, and exacerbation of interethnic relations. The scale of the most contradictory and acute ideological currents in society, from monarchical through anarcho-syndicalist, has grown. All this has extended the ideological span and engendered uncertainty in the future of the Communist Party and the USSR. Voices were heard virtually speaking of the impending split of the CPSU and claims that this congress would be the last. However, the party forum emphatically rejected these gloomy forecasts.

Mention should be made of the contradictoriness and at times inordinately critical—more precisely carping—mood of some of the speeches. But for all that, commonsense, realism, and constructivism prevailed on the whole, which was clearly reflected in the congress' final documents.

The first and main conclusion is that the party's policy of perestroyka and the democratization of intraparty life was confirmed and consolidated.

Second, the congress continued the policy of delineation of the functions of party and state and the conversion of the CPSU from the nucleus of the administrative command system into a mass social and political organization.

An important result of the work of the congress was its consolidating role. Despite the numerous prophecies, no split at the congress occurred. This was avoided thanks to compromise in the formulation of the program statement in which a great deal was synthesized from the Leningrad, Democratic, and Marxist platforms. The CPSU's devotion to the socialist choice was confirmed unambiguously here.

And one further appreciable point. The congress recognized the political and moral responsibility of the party and state leadership of the country for the situation that has taken shape.

Of course it was hard to expect the congress to have provided answers and ready-made prescriptions in respect to all problems currently confronting the country, the party, and society.

At the same time many people were expecting that the highest party forum would clearly offer society prospects of a transformation of the economic basis of our state under market conditions. The answer, seemingly, was given in the documents of the 28th CPSU Congress. But a certain sense of things unspoken and uncertainty remained. The vulnerability of the position is primarily that as of now there has been no "script" of a transition to market relations that has been worked out in detail, no sequence of action has been determined, and there is no mechanism for surmounting possible negative phenomena comprehensible to all. Nor are both the ultimate goals and the actual prospects awaiting us entirely clear.

What are we in fact building? Either a socialist society permitting capitalist elements to stimulate economic growth in the USSR, or a capitalist society with a certain level of socialization of the state capitalism type?

We do not have the right to evade this issue and get by with general phrases and not disclose the progress and focus of the processes of perestroyka in all their relationships. We need to respond directly. Political confidence in the party and the solution of many subsequent problems will depend on this. As far as our position is concerned, it is unequivocal: We are for a renewed, humane, democratic socialism and the building of a society that does in fact uphold and defend the interests of the working people.

It is necessary first and foremost to solve problems of introducting effective methods of influencing the state economic sector on the situation as a whole. It would seem essential for state ownership to encompass the infrastructure, the raw material sectors, power engineering, large-scale industry including defense industry, the banks, and social security and insurance.

Personal and private ownership, on the other hand, will be established mainly in the sphere of service, food and light industry, and in agriculture.

It is essential here to determine legislatively the limits and forms of the privatization of state ownership, the boundaries of private enterprise, and the forms and methods of protection of public interests and the rights of individual citizens.

We need to be clearly aware that even such a development of events will be attended by the unchecked growth of inflation; a widening of the proportions of unemployment and a lowering of the living standard of many social strata and categories of working people; and the rapid social stratification of the population in terms of income level and well-being. For this reason the obkom [oblast committee] intends formulating its own social program with regard for these factors and seeking its

realization via the Communists working in the soviets, the unions, public organizations, industry, and agriculture.

The multistructural nature of the economy and the increased social inequality will inevitably lead to the appearance of a strict ideological and political confrontation in society and real multiparty conditions in which the parties will defend strictly defined social strata. And this inevitably poses the question of a really new role of the CPSU in society. The party will struggle for the political power of the working people and a majority and influence in the soviets and act the part of constructive opposition where necessary. Under such conditions the CPSU can no longer be a party of all the people, and its social base will objectively be composed of working people of the state sector of the economy and certain strata of employees of other economic structures.

Everyone must finally responsibly recognize that there is in the modern world no state in which actual governments and all social movements are not headed by this political party or the other, or are not under their influence. It has to be seen that with us also many public formations are rapidly assuming this political character or the other. For this reason the idea of the depoliticization of state and public structures, which is being actively championed by various radical movements, is absurd or a deliberate ploy aimed at dismantling the CPSU.

Under these conditions we will insist on the organizational and ideological revival of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Communist Party taking the said factors maximally into account.

As you know, the draft action program of the RSFSR Communist Party was published recently. It has to be said that the document, which appeared greatly behind schedule, is of a largely contradictory nature and abounds in general phrases. This applies particularly to the socioeconomic section and the propositions concerning the party's place and role under market conditions.

As far as the fundamental position of the obkom is concerned, it is that it is essential to preserve the leading position in the economic structure of socialism in renewal of the state ownership of the means of production. We are for the formation of an effective and flexible mechanism of state administration providing together with legal and financial and credit regulators for the active use of planning. We are for consistent implementation of the economic reform on this basis and the surmounting of the prejudice against the market as, equally, the disappearance of dependent sentiments in society. But we are opposed to the capitalization of the entire system of social, and primarily economic, relations in the country. The crisis state of the economy insistently demands comprehensively weighed and considered steps en route to the market. Rash transient directions of a solution could only intensify the already difficult situation.

The situation in the Leningrad region is largely similar to the state of affairs in the Union. The rate of economic development in the economy of Leningrad and the oblast in the first half of 1990 continued to decline. In industry this was manifested in a diminution in production. The fulfillment of contractual product supply obligations deteriorated, and the number of enterprises that allowed major breakdowns to occur increased compared with last year.

Given a more than doubling of commodity turnover compared with the average annual increase in four years of the 12th Five-Year Plan in trade, shortages of both industrial commodities and food are continuing to grow. A speculative market is operating openly and on an ever increasing scale.

Meat production and purchases have declined and the area sown to potatoes and vegetables has diminished in agriculture.

The amount of contract work in the construction organizations of Leningrad and the oblast diminished compared with the first six months of 1989. The introduction of total area in housing construction in Leningrad was 38 percent, in the oblast 9 percent, less than in the first six months of 1989.

The amount of freight haulage on common-user transport declined: 12 percent in motor transport, three percent in railroad transport, and two percent in river transport.

The average earnings of workers and employees in the first six months of this year here increased by 22 rubles [R] compared with the corresponding period of last year.

The erratic nature of production and the transition to contracted prices are increasing the inflationary processes and leading to growth of deficits in retail trade. The cause of the accumulating difficulties is well known—the old economic management system is being dismantled; but the new one, based on market relations, has not yet begun to work.

The increase in social difficulties is reflected in the political situation which is not stabilizing either. More than a dozen social and political groups and parties of the most diverse persuasions are operating actively in Leningrad and certain districts of the oblast, and some of them have an avowedly antisocialist thrust. Factional struggle is making a certain mark on the activity of the new composition of the Leningrad City Soviet also.

The deterioration in Leningraders' socioeconomic position typical of the transition period and brought about to a certain extent by the miscalculations and mistakes in

the activity of the soviets of various levels has engendered a certain loss of trust in the current power structures, disenchantment, and skepticism.

Going on to note that it is essential to take all these circumstances into consideration and defining immediate action prospects, B.V. Gidaspov switched to the formulation of the tasks of the oblast party organization.

Aware of its entire responsibility to Leningraders for the state of affairs in the region, the obkom makes it its goal to contribute to the achievement of a different quality of the life of the population of city and oblast worthy of a citizen of a civilized state. This can only be achieved by having fundamentally changed the entire system of economic and management ties and relations and by having accorded the workforce real economic independence.

A strong social policy in Leningrad and the oblast may be based, in our opinion, only on highly efficient labor.

Reality has confirmed the soundness of our political assessments of the region's social problems and the conclusions and proposals ensuing therefrom, which we made at the joint plenum of the Leningrad Obkom and city party committees in November 1989.

What is holding back the city's development? Primarily the slow decentralization of the management of the national economic complex and the transfer of power authority from the ministries to the workforce and the soviets. The diktat of the local authorities cannot be permitted to substitute for the diktat of the center here. Supporting methods of management that have proven their efficiency, such as the consortium and enterprise associations, the party organizations will thereby contribute to the creation of the competition of the commodity producers and commodities and the integration of the domestic and foreign markets.

The most promising direction of the modernization of the structure of Leningrad's industry could, in our view, be a sharp increase in the proportion of enterprises of the newest sectors manufacturing high-technology consumer products. The growth of their production and equivalent exchange with other regions could solve the problem of the filling of Leningrad's stores with the necessary industrial and consumer goods.

A most acute problem is that of converting the defense sectors which employ here approximately 700,000 persons. We are well aware of the problems that they are encountering even now and that will confront them on an even greater scale in the immediate future. We realize that this is fraught with the most serious consequences: primarily with the loss of highly skilled personnel and the scientific and research base, and consequently the loss of leading positions in many areas of S&T progress, not only in Leningrad but also the country as a whole. After all, 70 percent of the research institutes and design bureaus in the shipbuilding field, for example, are concentrated in our city.

We cannot permit such a development of events. And the obkom intends using every available opportunity, up to and including the sponsoring of a legislative initiative in the Union Supreme Soviet concerning a revision of the current provisions and the formulation of an efficient conversion mechanism.

The main purpose of the party's activity lies in a struggle for social justice and for the creation of the necessary conditions for the revelation in full of people's creative capabilities. At the same time, however, we believe that it is time to rid ourselves of a dependent understanding of social justice as an obligation of the state to pay the gifted and the talentless, the toiler and the slacker, the conscientious worker and the absentee an equal amount. The socialist principle of distribution according to labor must be observed unswervingly. At the same time, the Communists will support and develop in every possible way the initiatives of the workforce, public organizations and formations, and individual citizens pertaining to the needy strata of the population being given material and financial assistance.

The party organization will submit a proposal to the Leningrad Oblast Soviet and the Leningrad City Soviet concerning the elimination of all restrictions on constitutional forms of the citizens' land tenure, meaning the removal in full of lines for the allocation of plots of land for individual housing construction and the building of dachas, garden-plot houses, and garages.

The present time is distinguished by serious breakdowns in the food supply to the population, primarily of locally produced vegetables and potatoes. Woven into the knot of problems are transport disorders and increased retail prices, lack of organization within the vegetable production line, and the lack of full attention in the solution of serious questions of the countryside on the part of enterprises of Leningrad and the oblast. And unfortunately, the Leningrad City and oblast soviets have proven incapable of controlling this process.

Having made a number of the corresponding statements, the organs of state power—the soviets of people's deputies—were obliged from day one to assume responsibility for the fate of the harvest and provision of the population with food. In April, July, and now in August, they have examined questions concerning the situation in agriculture and the relations of town and country. But the food situation has in this time deteriorated noticeably. Leningrad is now experiencing a daily vegetable shortfall of 300-400 tons. September will be the time for mass harvesting, but there will be no one to conduct it and many enterprises and higher educational institutions have failed to conclude sponsorship assistance contracts. It will be necessary to place in the repositories expensive imported produce, if it still arrives. The region is on the threshold of a food crisis. And this given a record yield in the oblast's potato and vegetable fields! The anger of the population, of the middle- and low-pay strata particularly, at the shortage of produce and the high prices is growing.

On 17 August, the obkom bureau discussed the situation concerning harvesting in the oblast and provision of the population with food, seeing as its mission support for the soviets on these matters and practical assistance to them in the mobilization of the Communists for the harvesting and help to the countryside.

Although from the very outset, back in April, both the obkom and a number of Communist deputies warned that the Leningrad City Soviet's decision to decline sponsored assistance and coordination of this work was a mistake, the party organization nonetheless believes that it shares the responsibility for the present serious situation.

Unfortunately, time has largely been let slip, and the decision of the July joint meeting of the presidiums of the city and oblast soviets and the present decision of the oblast soviet presidium to announce a state of emergency in the oblast for the harvesting period are to a considerable extent a sham not buttressed by serious practical measures.

It is necessary to speak about the obkom's relations with the Leningrad City Soviet, B.V. Gidaspov went on to say. This question is troubling many Leningraders and is of fundamental significance.

The nature and dynamics of these relations are influenced by a whole number of factors: primarily the affinity of strategic sociopolitical goals of our activity and their concurrence or divergence; second, the socioeconomic situation that is actually taking shape in the city and the region as a whole; third, the positions of the Communist deputies in the soviet, the effectiveness of their activity and the possibilities of really influencing adopted decisions and their realization; and finally, the degree of the objective trust of Leningraders themselves in the actual managerial activity of the Leningrad City Soviet under the new conditions.

It cannot be said that the nature of our relations with the soviet is today satisfactory. There are problems here—this needs to be plainly said—primarily concerning the concurrence of strategic sociopolitical goals. The Communists advocate a renewal of all spheres of the activity of our society on a socialist basis. Humane democratic socialism creating the conditions for the free comprehensive development of each individual as an objective basis for the harmonious development of all of society—this is our immediate historical goal.

We wholly share, for example, the concern of A.A. Sobchak, chairman of the Leningrad City Soviet, at the decline in labor discipline as well as the level of civic self-awareness and a sense of duty to society among some Leningraders which he expressed in a recent television appearance. We also fully support the deputies' decisions on an increase in citizens' responsibility for the observance of legality and law and order.

Do we disagree? Evidently not with those, of course, who are for a socialist choice of our societal development. But today the Leningrad City Soviet abounds in all colors of the political palette. This is an objective fact. Inordinate politicization is not only today impeding the process of consolidation of the corps of deputies itself but is also being reflected in the tempo and quality of organization of the business of the soviet and its actual influence on the state of affairs in the city.

In this period of formation, difficult for the soviet, the oblast party committee has offered repeatedly and continues to offer constructive cooperation. The conference of Leningrad Communists specifically advocated a pooling of efforts of the corps of deputies of Leningrad and the oblast and the party committees in the interests of the inhabitants of the region.

However, it cannot be said that our constructive position has been accepted by all deputies. In many public statements by individual deputies, it has been ignored and glossed over, and at times even simply deliberately distorted. I would like to call the deputies' attention to the fact that the endless playing and speculation on the subject of the apparatus is a road leading nowhere. Without noticing it themselves or not recognizing it to the full extent, many deputies, having assumed full-time positions in the soviet, have essentially become a regular apparatus of soviet power and are in no way insured against bureaucratization, red tape, and authoritarian methods of leadership. In addition, instead of the separation of powers promised the electorate, a degeneration of the legislative into an executive authority is taking place. This fact induces reflection on the sources of a possible detachment of the soviet from the masses, disregard for people's real interests, and the conversion of a democratic soviet into a bureaucratic soviet. As you know, we have seen this in our history.

One further feature has been manifested in the activity of certain deputies. This has been the stirring of the political situation, which is dangerous for the stability of the situation in the city. Unceremonious attacks on the CPSU in public speeches; an endeavor to discredit party measures and decisions with a view to keeping the city running; speculation on the difficulties of the current period and attempts to evade responsibility for the actual situation in education, health care, municipal services, trade, transport and food and local industry have been set in process.

The public is responding sharply to this. For example, this is what the Leningrader B.A. Nikonorov wrote to the obkom: "Almost six months have elapsed and chaos and lawlessness reign in the city, the organization of assistance to the countryside has been disrupted, and the whole fervor of the deputies is aimed at the disintegration of the Communist Party. One has the impression that as soon as everyone has quit the CPSU, and as soon as the deputies of a 'democratic persuasion' have swept aside all who were in one way or another involved in the former system, the ideal state based on the rule of law will then emerge. Against this background certain newspapers and television are frequently carrying on the air

and in their publications disinformation, avowedly juggled facts and direct insults."

We would add on behalf of the writers of other letters that, in their opinion, the newspapers SMENA and CHAS PIK, the television programs "Fifth Wheel" and "600 Seconds," and certain others have been particularly sedulous in this field.

Our mailbag contains a multitude of such opinions, and their number has been growing of late.

The public is worried by the growth of civil confrontation, flashes of extremism and aggressiveness and the intensity of the intolerance, primarily among the youth on whom the socioeconomic crisis is having a particularly serious impact and thus engendering a political and ideological crisis. Does it have to be artificially fanned further?

We appeal to the artistic intelligentsia, journalists, and all who are professionally concerned with the human heart and who by methods of art shape the personality to rise to the defense of people's moral world.

We call on deputies to shape and realize a regional youth policy encompassing the sphere of labor and education under market conditions and the leisure time of adolescents, young men and women, and the whole younger generation.

Leningraders are remarking also that on certain most important questions of the prospects of the city's development the Leningrad City Soviet is not even troubling to thoroughly consult its electorate. We are talking primarily of the free economic zone.

We believe it absolutely essential to conduct wide-ranging public discussion of alternative concepts of Leningrad's conversion into a free enterprise zone. Each inhabitant of the city, as an equal co-owner of Leningrad's public property—the land, historical and cultural monuments, and fixed production capital—has the right to know precisely what the transition to free market relations in Leningrad will mean for him, his family, and his work outfit.

In our opinion, the Leningrad City Soviet should not only be forecasting the future socioeconomic situation with exhaustive accuracy, but also with full responsibility, declaring directly all its intentions. Here it would seem, there should be no silences and ambiguity, unconsidered decisions even less.

We are for the joint quest for, and realization without delay of, the most effective measures for a solution of the housing and food problems of the city; the speediest solution of the numerous contradictions in municipal services and the problems in health care, culture, and public education; and for a strengthening of law and order.

The mass meetings of medical practitioners in Palace Square were held under pressure of circumstances. Yet again the medical practitioners were attempting to call the attention of the townspeople and the Leningrad City Soviet to the calamitous health care situation. The response has been merely talk about a shortage of money for the needs of the city's medicine and education and culture.

Meanwhile the specter of strikes of doctors and nurses, preschool educators, figures of culture, and transport workers is stalking Leningrad and threatening to become a cruel reality.

The obkom is working on an additional package of proposals and initiatives which we will discuss in the immediate future with the communist deputies, and via them propose to the Leningrad city, oblast, and rayon soviets.

A qualitatively new stage of intraparty life began essentially, B.V. Gidaspov continued, as of the 28th CPSU Congress: practical work on converting the party from having been an integral part of the official administrative-command system into a genuinely political organization in the generally accepted, civilized meaning of this concept. This is the first aspect. The second is no less important: The congress enshrined the supremacy in the party of the interests and power of the party masses at large in the shape of the primary organizations; I emphasize, did not proclaim as was frequently the case earlier, but enshrined in actual provisions of the CPSU Rules.

It was hardly accidental that barely had the rules been approved before once again a concerted chorus of voices was heard concerning its undemocratic nature, incapacity for protecting the rights of the minority, the fact that they still contained many of the "birthmarks" of centralism, and as a general conclusion the need for their revision.

It is hard to believe that those who maintain such things are motivated by a true concern for the party's interests and its future fate. One would have to be truly blind not to see that a continuation of the period of ideological and organizational diffusion in the party—and a revision of the rules would lead to precisely this—would be disastrous for it.

It would seem that our plenum should clearly and unambiguously express its position in respect of these statements. We believe that **the CPSU Rules have been approved and are for Communists the law.** They are not ideal; there are in them things that could be improved, but they are in effect and need to be executed unswervingly. Otherwise we will not halt the destabilizing process in the CPSU and will not resolve a single one of the numerous problems confronting us.

The principal one of these is the organizational and ideological strengthening of the primary party organizations, in whose hands today is the fate of the party.

The 28th congress put at the center of the activity of the primary organizations the working man and defense of

his social interests and the principle of social justice. It ensues from the congress' decisions that a revival of the spirit of party comradeship is today a central task in the process of the self-cleansing and self-development of the party.

This means primarily the exacting attitude of each member of the CPSU toward his political activity and the work of his party organization comrades and mutual support. Second, the task today is to create in the CPSU multiple-option systems for the social protection of each individual member on the part of the CPSU itself. This is particularly pressing under the conditions of a real multiparty system, transition to a market economy, and the growth of open anticommunism.

It is necessary here to take the path of the formation of the material funds of the primary party organizations, the creation of programs of the social protection of all party members in need, and the formation of a common fund for the support of small organizations. The savings of the primary party organizations should not lie as a dead weight, and it would be expedient to invest them in the form of shares in the funds of the party's financially autonomous enterprises which should be created on a joint-stock basis.

There is no need to wait for some instructions from executive authorities of the CPSU on this matter. The main thing is to act decisively. Each party member must be sure that the CPSU will, if necessary, protect his interests and political and economic rights. But this may be realized only in the event of each member of the party himself defending the honor and authority of his party and struggling actively for the accomplishment of its policy course.

Now a few thoughts on the matter of party discipline under the conditions of democratization of intraparty life. Speaking as a whole, party discipline today means compliance with the rules and the binding nature of the implementation of all their requirements. I would like to emphasize—not simply assent but conscious compliance via recognition of the fact that without discipline there is no party nor can there be. It is no secret that things here are far from brilliant today.

There is every reason for such a conclusion, unfortunately: There have already been instances of disregard for the congress' decisions by a number of organizations, concerning specifically the timeframe of transition to the new principles of formation of the party budget. We will at an upcoming obkom plenum discuss the entire set of these questions and offer all the primary party organizations our recommendations.

We have at our plenum to express our position apropos also the demands of certain leaders of the Democratic Platform and our opponents from other parties and movements who on the pretext of depoliticization of the economy are insisting on the removal of CPSU organizations from production and the workforce. The 28th congress spoke clearly enough on this score. We support this opinion.

But I would like to mention the following. Some of our party organizations are by their inaction affording our critics grounds for returning to this issue again and again. In fact, if a party organization today influences nothing, is responsible for nothing, is wholly reluctant to assume responsibility, intervenes in nothing and defends no one and nothing, is it not a natural question: What is the need for it at work and in the workforce?

Such a question does not arise where the party organizations work consistently and act. But unfortunately, so far there are not that many of these.

We are not opposed to the territorial principle of the organizational composition of the CPSU. But from our viewpoint, and I believe the obkom members will agree, the universal transition to this principle in the immediate future is both insufficiently prepared and inexpedient. But we should be stepping up political work per the place of residence even now. At this stage, I believe, we should be looking for approaches and alternatives through a combination of production and territorial principles and take two routes here: both the more meaningful and active participation of the party organizations in the life of the territories and the creation of new territorial organizations.

The upcoming report and election campaign in the primary, city, and rayon party organizations should be a subject of our particular concern. The main problem here is the personnel of the elective bodies. It is as clear as could be that the future fate of the oblast organization essentially depends on who heads the party committees of all levels and who is a member of them.

New, fresh forces will undoubtedly appear among the secretaries and members of the party committees, and this is natural. But as far as possible it is also necessary to preserve the nucleus and cadres who are tried and tested in this work. The majority of them have been brought forward by perestroyka and are active supporters, and in addition already possess certain skills of working under the most complex conditions of acute political struggle. And this is valuable property.

Considering the results of the multiple-choice elections to the obkom and of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress—when the proportion among members of the obkom and delegates to the congress of workers, peasants, and women proved absolutely not to correspond to their actual role and proportion in the party—not inappropriate also, I believe, is the question of the introduction for these categories of Communists of quotas in the elective party authorities as a mechanism of protecting their political rights. This applies equally to both the primary and city and rayon party organizations.

Effectively solving all these problems is impossible without a reorganization of the structure of the rayon components of the oblast organization. Under the new conditions, when many powers in the party have been transferred to the primary party organizations, the role of these support structural components of the party should be fundamentally different.

I stress once more the urgency of the financial problem. Preliminary calculations made by the obkom's administration of affairs show that, in accordance with the rules, the total membership dues to be put at the disposal of the gorkoms and raykoms [city and rayon party committee] from the primary party organizations will decline as of 1 January of next year no less than twofold. Add here a possible reduction in the strength of the party organizations, a change in the scale and percentage of the contributions, and reduced income from the Leningrad Publishing House.

What do we see as the solution here? In our view, there are two paths.

The first is a structural reorganization of the gorkoms and raykoms and the apparatus, and possibly a reduction also in the number of rayon committees in Leningrad.

And the second path, I have already touched on, is the commercial, entrepreneurial activity of the oblast party organization and party committees of all levels.

It would be wrong were we at our plenum not to express our opinion of the growing campaign in the press and on television concerning the nationalization of the property of the party which, as a structural component of the administrative-command system, allegedly acquired it in criminal fashion. The congress distinctly expressed its opinion. We believe that it reflects our opinion also. The demand for the nationalization of CPSU property and the arguments being adduced by its authors are unlawful and immoral. It is speculation and a political play on the serious difficulties that are being experienced by our people and the country and an attempt by inappropriate means to make dubious political capital.

But nonetheless, we need to conduct a thorough inventory of our property in order to put our property rights within the framework of current legislation, and then without fail convey such information openly and in detail to all inhabitants of Leningrad and the oblast.

A few words about our attitude toward the Communists adhering to the Democratic Platform (DP).

On 15 June the DP Coordinating Council adopted a decision on the withdrawal of its supporters from the CPSU. This decision was supported by far from all of the movement's participants, and an actual split occurred. Some members of the DP remained in the CPSU, and others declared their intention of forming a new political party of a "parliamentary" type whose name will be chosen in October at the constituent congress. Following the congress, there will be a joint congress of the new party and the Democratic Party of Russia and the Social Democratic Party of the RSFSR at which, possibly, a bloc of democratic parties of Russia based on the so-called independent workers movement and operating under the flag of anticommunism will be formed. The Russian Democratic Front, which emerged comparatively recently and which occupies extremist positions, also will align itself with it.

We express an interest both in the preservation of the "left" wing in the CPSU, in the form of the remaining part of the DP, and in the development of dialogue with all parties of the "socialist choice".

Proceeding from the CPSU's new role in society, our party organization faces big tasks pertaining to a restructuring of the entire system of the party organization's ideological work.

One such task is development of the political consciousness of Leningrad's Communists and an enhancement of Leningraders' political culture. The first need is theoretical study of all the most acute issues currently being discussed, such as the "decline of Marxism," the "erroneousness of the socialist choice," "Lenin's role in history," and others. In this respect the 28th congress advocated a stimulation of the work of social scientists. We have supported and will continue to support the efforts of Leningrad specialists in this field. It obviously makes sense to create a system of party and interparty clubs at city and oblast rayon level, a Leningrad interparty club included.

Considering the real multiparty conditions, it is essential that we draw up a comprehensive program of the interaction and cooperation of the Leningrad party organization and other social and political parties and movements of a socialist orientation. It is time to switch from words to deeds. It is essential to conduct "roundtables" and agree on the forms and methods of cooperation and specific activities. A great deal of work has to be done on propaganda and explanation of the material of the 28th congress. We must engage all our resources and channels here: lecture propaganda, political training, and the mass media.

In conclusion, I have to say that we are allotted no warmup time. Everyone has to reorganize on the move. It is essential to show in practice that the oblast party organization is not dragging along in the rear of events, but is able to forecast the situation and plan its actions and accomplish them. On the concerted actions of each will depend the success of the entire party organization as a whole.

Udmurt ASSR Issues Declaration of Sovereignty

PM2509125190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Alyans Sabirov: "Udmurtiya's Sovereignty Proclaimed"]

[Text] Izhevsk—Henceforth this former autonomous oblast and then autonomous soviet socialist republic [ASSR] will simply be known as the Udmurt Republic.

The declaration on sovereignty was adopted by a majority of votes at an extraordinary session of the republic's parliament. The document stresses that the development of independent statehood is possible only within a renewed Russian federation. It is planned to establish treaty relations on an equal basis with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic and the USSR. The supremacy of Udmurtiya's constitution and laws on its territory has also been declared. The land, natural resources, economic potential, and cultural and historical values have been declared the property of the republic's people. Two languages—Udmurt and Russian—have been recognized as state languages.

As in other regions the adoption of the declaration reflected an urgent need for resolute changes. The basis of industry here consists of giant defense enterprises. But because of the hastily initiated conversion without substantiation or elementary calculations, production output has been cut by 1.2 billion rubles. Unemployment is becoming a reality. Udmurtiya today can be called an economic disaster zone. And vigorous measures are needed to lead it out of the crisis. But the local soviets are so far powerless. Will sovereignty help them acquire strength and efficiency?

Urals Oblasts Move To Strengthen Economic Links

PM2609161590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent G. Shcherbina: "Urals Solidarity"]

[Text] Someone remarked about this conference held in Chelyabinsk: "It looks like there is going to be another republic—the Urals Economic Republic." It was said in jest of course, but even so....

The idea was first broached by N. Mironov, chairman of the Udmurt ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers. And soon representatives of two autonomous republics and five oblasts in the Urals region met in Chelyabinsk for a roundtable discussion. The theme: How to work together most sensibly and efficiently in conditions of the transition to the market economy.

I should like to note immediately that despite the keen discussion, there was no "selfishness." Each of the participants in the meeting, of course, was motivated by the interests of his administrative territory. But in general there was a concern that the more than 20 million people living in the great Urals region—from the Arctic to the Caspian—should feel stability in their lives and changes for the better. It was this concern that permeated the document "On the Principles of Economic Relations Among the Autonomous Republics and Oblasts of the Urals Economic Region in the Period of Transition to a Market Economy." The representatives of the Bashkir and Udmurt ASSRs and Kurgan, Orenburg, Perm, Sverdlovsk, and Chelyabinsk oblasts rejected the "adoption of decisions which block the fulfillment of the economic reform program" and intend not only to prevent a devastating collapse of the production, financial-credit, and trade ties among them but also to work toward further strengthening them. I asked P. Sumin, chairman of the Chelyabinsk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee, to clarify these tasks and forms of cooperation:

"It is clear to everyone now," he said, "that the country is being torn apart by the struggle for autonomy between republics and oblasts and enterprises and production associations. This process could have been regarded as beneficial had that autonomy not turned into self-isolation. The established economic ties are being stretched to breaking point in the search for more beneficial partnership.

"To avoid further disintegration, we agreed to retain for the next two years the economic ties existing in 1989; retain them but not freeze them. On the basis of strengthening the economy of the Urals autonomous republics and oblasts we will observe most-favored status with regard to one another.

"We will create joint ventures, especially as we have already gained instructive experience. For several years now Chelyabinsk workers have cooperated with workers in Sverdlovsk and Perm to produce silage combines on production-sharing principles. In this way we can jointly increase the production of hay stacking machines on the basis of the Udmurt ASSRs capacities.

"As for supplying the market with consumer goods and creating technologies and equipment for the processing industry, medicine, and other sectors, we are pinning our hopes here on the 'Ural-konversiya' corporation which we plan to formally inaugurate at the end of September."

Here is the opinion of V. Gerasimov, chairman of the Kurgan Oblast Soviet Executive Committee:

"The act on Urals cooperation that has been signed will be a counterweight to central diktat, which in an arbitrary and often absurd fashion fixed us up with unsuitable partners. For example, in exchange for the supply of meat we have to ship certain construction materials many thousands of kilometers from the Far East. But all these things are close at hand—in industrial Chelyabinsk, which is short of meat...."

To these comments it should be added that the steps thus taken will not affect the fulfillment of commitments to partners in other regions in the slightest. The Urals people know how to keep their word.

New Party Seeks Formation of Far East Republic

PM2609151190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Sep 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Usoltsev under the rubric "Direct Line": "'Epidemic' of Transformations Continues"]

[Text] Khabarovsk, 21 September—The formation of a Far Eastern republic is one of the main tasks of the Far Eastern Republic Freedom Party (FERFP) which recently held its constituent congress in Vladivostok. This new social formation has declared itself to be a republic party opposed to any diktat from the center. Judging by the FERFP leaders' statement, it is a free, civic party which recognizes the priority of individual interests over the interests of society. It proclaims freedom of enterprise and private initiative, denationalization of the state sector, and de-ideologization of the Army and law enforcement bodies.

You could say that the FERFP is an offshoot of the Democratic Union. Former Democratic Union members are among its founders. And the chairman of the FERFP is A. Zabolotnikov, a Democratic Union activist in Primorye and a deputy of the kray soviet.

The FERFP wants to win power in the region. It intends to hold a unification congress in the near future and form a coalition made up of the FERFP, the Khabarovsk National Front, and other organizations.

Karelia Retaliates Over Food Delivery Shortage

PM2609143590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Report by B. Ternoushko from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] Karelia announced today that it is suspending shipments of timber, timber materials used in papermaking, and other types of output to a number of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] oblasts.

[Ternoushko] Over the past month or two, many everyday foodstuffs have disappeared from Petrozavodsk and other towns and villages of the autonomous republic. There is virtually no meat or meat products. People have long forgotten what hard cheeses taste like. The list of products in short supply covers virtually all kinds of fruit and vegetables. There are huge lines for tobacco, and more recently for bread. [Video shows rally with banners stating: "Government, Feed Us!"; "Saboteur Rulers Should Resign!!!"; "Hard-Working and Skilled People Don't Fear the Market"; "President! Run the Republic, Not the Russian Communist Party"] Under these conditions, more and more labor collectives, timber industry enterprises, and industrial plants are warning that they may strike. This whole problem has been caused by the virtual cessation of reciprocal shipments of foodstuffs to Karelia, despite the fact that it has met 98 percent of its contractual commitments. A week ago the session of the autonomous republic's Supreme Soviet which examined measures to get out of the emergency food situation was forced to take retaliatory measures. A government telegram was sent to RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Yeltsin and RSFSR Council of Ministers Chairman Silayev. It stated that unless Karelia receives what it has been promised, then as of 24 September shipments of timber products, newsprint, and construction materials will be suspended. [passage omitted]

Sverdlovsk Air Crash Reported

PM2609162390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Report by Ye. Orlov and cameraman V. Ilinets from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpt] [Announcer] Our Volgograd correspondent reports the details of the air crash a few days ago involving a Yak-42 landing at Sverdlovsk Airport.

[Orlov] Just what happened when the Yak-42 was landing at night in bad weather?

[Yu.Ya. Dmitriyev, air detachment commander] The crew, headed by a pilot-inspector from the North Caucasus Administration's Training Center, descended too early on final approach and by the time they decided to go around it was too late. The plane crashed 1,700 meters short of the runway, almost perfectly lined up. Pilot error on the part of the captain is being investigated. [passage omitted]

Kalmyk CPSU First Secretary Released

LD2509140990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] A plenum of the Kalmyk Oblast committee of the CPSU took place in Elista today, at which an organizational matter was examined. In connection with Zakharov's confirmation as head of the department for organizational party and cadre work of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, he has been released from the duties of first secretary of the Kalmyk Oblast committee of the CPSU.

The plenum adopted a decision to rename the oblast party organization a republican party organization, and ratified a provision on the formation of elective organs and the status and action program of the republican organization.

The matter of electing the first secretary will be decided at a later date.

New Daily Newspaper To Be Launched

LD2709091790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 27 Sep 90

[Text] The first issue of the newspaper TUMENSKIYE IZVESTIYA has been published by the oblast soviet of

peoples' deputies. It will soon be published along with TUMENSKAYA PRAVDA, the CPSU obkom's [oblast committee] publication. It has been decided that its first weekly issues will be sold over the counter, but when the subscription campaign has finished TUMENSKIYE IZVESTIYA will be published daily.

Western Republics

Belorussia, Tajikistan Sign Economic Accord

LD2609184190 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1600 GMT 23 Sep 90

[Summary] An agreement on economic cooperation until 1996 was signed in Minsk between the Soviet republics of Belorussia and Tajikistan. In line with the agreement Belorussia will receive cotton, grapes, raisins, construction materials, and technical hardware. Tajikistan will be receive consumer goods and chemical products.

Moldavian Party Appeals to Gagauz Communists

90UN2855A Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA in Russian 2 Sep 90 p 1

["Appeal to the Communists of Gagauz Nationality" by secretaries of the primary party organizations of the Leovskiy Rayon]

[Text] Dear Comrades! It is not easy to find the words now that would be able to express fully our feelings, experience, and thoughts. Nonetheless we, participants in a meeting of secretaries of the primary party organizations of Leovskiy Rayon, decided to appeal to you.

A time of great trials has arrived for the people of our republic.

Sharing the alarm and condemnation that the decisions of the First Congress of People's Deputies, held on 19 August in Komrat, evoke among a majority of the Communists of our rayon, we appeal to you not to submit to provocation no matter what the source of such attempts are, for all of us bear the responsibility for the preservation of peace in our common home—our Moldova.

We are confident that there can be no perestroyka without soberness of thought, wisdom, realism, respect for the law, and a high political culture and democratic tradition. These qualities are needed more than ever when there is a question of interethnic relations. We cannot surrender the fate of fraternal relations that have evolved over centuries to the control of emotions, unbridled ambitions, the elements, and anarchy.

Party Brothers! There is still time to avert a dramatic unfolding of events and to find ways to mutually acceptable decisions on a principled basis, taking into account the opinions and interests of all people living in the republic. But it is necessary for each of you who listens to the voice of reason, to do everything possible to stop the separatist tendencies that could entail unforeseen consequences. Even without this, our people have endured so many hardships that we should not add one more to their number.

We must not forget that the friendship between our people can be wrecked in one day, but that its restoration will require decades.

Moldova is and must remain a united socialist and sovereign republic.

This appeal was approved at a meeting of the secretaries of primary party organizations of the Leovskiy Rayon.

Moldavian Leaders Extol Party Unity

90UN2855B Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDOVA in Russian 2 Sep 90 p 2

[Report by I. Lipchin from the press center of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee: "We Must Act Together"]

[Text] **The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee held a conference of republic representatives and secretaries of primary party organizations that considered the progress of perestroyka, the style and methods of work under current conditions, and other problems of inner-party life. We offer our readers a short verbatim report of speeches given by individual members at the conference.**

P.K. Luchinskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee:

We have assembled on the initiative of a group of secretaries of primary party organizations of the republic to consider those problems that trouble all of us today: both in the Central Committee and in the localities, to consult with each other on how to act in specific cases, and how to resolve questions that come up in a better way and more effectively. Take for example withdrawal from the CPSU. In just six months of this year, the republic's party organization was reduced by more than 3,000 persons. This should alert us and compel us to do some serious thinking. People are leaving the CPSU for various reasons. They became disenchanted with the ideas and aims that we proclaimed, others simply lost their heads and do not want to "get involved" in this politically complicated and unpredictable life, and still others pursue speculative aims. This, in my opinion, is a category of people that joined the CPSU out of career and selfish motives. And it is good that they are leaving. The party will get smaller numerically, but it will change qualitatively. And in the future, I think, it would be good in primary party organizations to conduct individual conversations with each member of the party, for it is necessary in the final analysis to determine who is who? The party does not need pseudo-communists who today say one thing and tomorrow act absolutely differently. Party committees and primary party organizations must know the intention and position of each Communist, and where necessary to assist, to provide support in

every way possible, and to change their mind. It is not the one who leaves the party "with pomp" who is considered courageous, but the one who in this period that is difficult for us does not get rid of the party card and who does everything possible for the strengthening of the CPSU and for its rebirth. I am not building any illusions, but I believe that soon the party ranks will replenish themselves with real Communists with initiative who are convinced, staunch, and active participants in the perestroyka processes. It is here that all of us together have to prove that the CPSU is a party that is really for the people and serves only the interests of the people.

D.Kh. Bologan, secretary of the primary party organization of the collective farm imeni Frunze and the secondary school in the village of Satul-Nou in Chimishliyskiy Rayon:

I am troubled first and foremost by problems of interethnic relations. The proclamation of a Gagauz Republic in the USSR system is not a thoughtful step. It complicated the sociopolitical situation even more.

People of various nationalities work here on our farm. All of them want peace and tranquility. It is only in this way that we could harvest grain and other agricultural products in a timely way. But is it really good when we, rural workers, are in the field until 0200 trying to gather the entire crop, but because of interethnic relations we are not given wagons and other transport in time? Whom does this benefit? The simple people are tired of politics. They want to live peacefully and to work.

Now with respect to individual "heroes" of perestroyka leaving the CPSU. Our primary party organization has 48 Communists within its ranks. Recently only one of them severed ties with it and the rest, as far as I know, are convinced that the CPSU is capable of coming out of the crisis with honor and with dignity. For this, it is also necessary to conduct an intensive search for effective forms of work with people, to practice political dialogues more frequently, to continuously coordinate the different opinions and positions of communists, to encourage initiative from below, and to join in its implementation.

G.M. Patrashku, secretary of the party committee of the state farm "Dregenesht" in Synzhereyskiy Rayon:

I do not know about others, but I personally do not like it when I hear groundless accusations directed at the party. On our farm, for example, the best tractor operators are Communists, the best drivers are members of the party, and so on. And it must be said that in our village no one says anything bad about the CPSU and Communists. Why should Communists who are honorable and dedicated to the cause suffer because of individual party leaders who compromised themselves? The Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee and the party rayon committee must concern themselves more with the defense of their honor and dignity.

T.V. Batushkina, secretary of the party committee of the plant "Mezon" imeni 60th Anniversary of the USSR, member of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, and a delegate to the 28th CPSU Congress

Undoubtedly meetings like this of the secretaries of the primary party organizations with members of the bureau and with other executives of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee are very useful for our work, especially in the present situation. This practice of exchanging opinions on various questions of interparty life must become the norm in the future because a shortage of contacts, if it can be put this way, is felt at each step. The existing hierarchical pyramid of party authority must be forced "to stir" and to restructure so all Communists would take part in the resolution of problems that are important in principle. Only in this way is it possible to control the situation and to find optimal and correct ways to make decisions in a timely way.

A.I. Lavrik, secretary of the party committee of the agrofirm "Progress" in Brichenskiy Rayon:

The appearance of new social organizations and formations requires that we build our mutual relations with them and also with trade unions, the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League, and other organizations on a principally new basis. Not quitting even one sphere of public life, we must conduct our own political line through Communists; develop and propose our own program of action to people; and offer our own objectives, agitate for them, and convince the people of the correctness of our cause. What are we doing specifically in this direction? First, we are striving in every way possible to repudiate the command-bureaucratic and authoritarian methods of work and to rid ourselves of functions that are uncharacteristic for a primary organization, achieving a vanguard role in society first and foremost with real results and creative initiative, and acting by proceeding from the specific situation and only in close cooperation with other public organizations and formations.

It was not long ago that we acted "alone." I have in mind the fact that every public organization or formation arranged its activity according to its own discretion. But this, naturally, did not do anything good for the further development of the village. And so we decided to create a distinctive village soviet that would unite, coordinate, and manage all available political forces. It was joined by representatives of two to three persons of the primary party organization, of the executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies, of the section of the people's front, of all religious organizations, of veterans of war and labor, of young people, and others. The soviet convenes and considers how best to do this, recommending various versions. With this we removed the atmosphere of distrust and confrontation between the primary party organization and other formations. As a result, the winners were the people in whose interests we

strive to work. But in the future, the soviet plans to expand its field of activity and to develop a specific program of action.

Ukrainian Coal Miners Put Off One-Day Strike

AU2609133690 Paris AFP in English 1316 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] Moscow, Sept 26 (AFP)—A one-day general strike in the Ukraine called by nationalist and reform movements has been postponed until Monday when the republic's parliament meets for its autumn session, nationalist sources said Wednesday.

The walk-out, supported by miners in the Soviet Union's largest coal basin, Donbas, was originally scheduled for Thursday.

A mass rally will be held in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital, Oles Fedoruk, spokesman for the regional inter-party group, a radical national movement that is to hold its first congress next week, said.

Miners' strike committees meeting Tuesday in Donetsk approved the targets of the proposed stoppage in the Soviet Union's second biggest republic, including closing down the Chernobyl nuclear power station, site of the world's worst nuclear accident in April 1986.

Strike organisers—a Coordinating Council of Democratic Associations and Democratic Blocs in the Ukraine Soviets, or parliaments—also want Ukrainian conscripts serving in other Soviet trouble spots to return home, as well as privatisation of property under worker control, and nationalisation of Communist Party assets.

The coordinating council was created last July.

Ukraine's Masol Views 1 Oct 'Challenge'

LD2609161190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] As earlier reported both by us and in the press, a republic-wide strike and national demonstration in Kiev are planned for 1 October in the Ukraine. Masol, head of the Ukrainian government, has called these intentions a challenge to the legally elected body of power and an attempt to provoke a serious political crisis. Speaking on Ukrainian television, Comrade Masol told viewers that additional decisions are already being prepared and will be adopted in the very near future, aimed at protecting the interests of the republic's population by economic methods, taxation policy, and other means.

Finds Political Climate 'Tough'

LD2609131590 Kiev International Service in English 2300 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] The Ukraine's Prime Minister, Vitaliy Masol, has made an appeal to the Ukrainian people.

The head of government determined the current social and political, as well as economic, situation as to be extremely tough. He also stressed that appeals of some political forces for a republican-wide strike and manifestations may cause a serious political crisis and complicate problems existing in our society.

On behalf of the Ukrainian Government, Vitaliy Masol in his appeal to the workers and farmers, intelligentsia, and youth, called upon them to reveal a deep understanding of the situation and unite efforts for progress in all spheres of our life.

Ukrainian Produce Bought Up Due to Price Hikes

PM2609155790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Sep 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by S. Tsikora: "Beginning of 'Meat War'?"]

[Text] Kiev—The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium has adopted a special decree banning the sale of output produced by the agro-industrial complex outside the republic in excess of the volumes set for export.

This is the republic's answer to the unilateral actions taken by Russia which sharply increased purchase prices for meat and other "strategic agricultural produce" without coordination. Huge livestock trailers rushed straightaway from the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] to southern areas of the Ukraine where they began to buy up bulls and hogs en masse. If you add to that the recent massive exports of grain from the republic you can understand the alarm which overtook the Ukrainian leadership. Speculation on price differences may cause grave consequences for the Ukrainian agro-industrial complex and lead, the decree says, "to a considerable reduction in food supplies for the republic's market and substantially worsen the population's food supply."

What specific measures is the republic taking? I quote the decree: "Prior to the transition to market conditions, free enterprise, and the establishment of new purchase prices, kolkhozes [collective farms], sovkhozes [state farms], other agricultural enterprises; cooperatives; and trading organizations are forbidden to sell agro-industrial complex output outside Ukrainian territory in excess of the volumes set for export or before receiving special authorization for this."

Strict sanctions are envisaged for offenders. An offender is not only deprived of all revenue from the sale of the produce, but is also "fined a corresponding sum."

A mechanism for notification of violations has already been worked out. It is not only the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] but also the republic's Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Internal Affairs with its territorial directorates that are responsible for monitoring fulfillment of the decree. This means that there will be highway checks and monitoring of bank accounts.

Attention has also been paid to the problem of what to do in the event of surpluses of agricultural produce emerging. The decree envisages that "Ukrainian consumer cooperative organizations will buy up livestock, meat, and meat products at personal subsidiary farms from leaseholders and at kolkhozes, sovkhozes, other enterprises, and organizations at agreed prices and sell it without profit to the population."

Donetsk Union Opposes All-Ukrainian Strike

LD2609225890 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 26 Sep 90

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent Stanislav Gasan]

[Text] Donetsk September 27 TASS—The participants in a meeting of the Regional Union of Strike Committees of the Donetsk Coal Basin (the Ukraine) refuted reports that strike committees of the coal basin support the calls for a strike all over the Ukraine. Miners believe that recourse to strikes should not be made at present when the country's and the republic's economy is burdened by difficulties.

Discussing slogans advanced by those who call for a strike, the participants in the meeting supported the slogans calling for the closure of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant, satisfaction of miners' economic and political demands, establishing workers' control over privatisation of enterprises, and nationalisation of property of the Ukrainian Communist Party. At the same time, the members of the regional union believe that miners can express support for these demands at rallies and assemblies at their workplaces, without stopping work.

Miners have not been preparing either for the October 1 strike or other strikes, it was emphasised at the meeting of the Regional Union of Strike Committees.

Caucasus

Armenians Hand in Weapons, Disband Armed Groups

LD2609150490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Report by Igor Zorin]

[Text] I have in my hands a report from Armenia. The confiscation of weapons and the voluntary surrender of weapons by illegal armed formations is continuing in Armenia. In Sisianskiy Rayon, the Drastamak group comprising 35 persons has declared that it is disbanding itself. In Araratskiy Rayon the disbandment has ben announced of three groups supporting ANA totaling up to 100 persons. ANA is, as I recall, the Armenia National Army—that was what this military formation was called.

In all, since the introduction of the state of emergency in the republic, 23 armed groups have ceased to exist. Individual citizens are also voluntarily handing in weapons. In all over 180 firearms, 43 hail-guns, over 12,000 rounds of ammunition, about 300 vehicles, and 13 radio stations have been returned. But it is unlikely that these figures will satisfy anyone. According to existing information, members of the Armenian population are at present holding over 1,100 automatic guns, 17 machineguns, over 1,200 pistols, almost the same number of carbines and rifles, 165 portable flamethrowers, two portable anti-aircraft systems, two grenade-launchers, over 560,000 cartridges, three hail-guns, five armored vehicles, and 1,423 other vehicles.

It is this fact that has forced the command of the local garrison and the leadership of the internal troops operative group to appeal to Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet. The document stresses in particular that the decision by the republic's Supreme Soviet on disbanding armed groups through its own efforts was greeted with satisfaction. But each day concern grows over the fact that less than three weeks remain to the deadline set by the USSR president for disarmament. A large number of weapons are in the hands of criminals, the report from Yerevan states. What is more, in the last few days confiscations have virtually stopped.

Weapons Seizures Continue Throughout NKAO

LD2609213790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Report by correspondent M. Mamedov in NKAO, from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer Fesunenko] Here is a report from the Nagorno Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO].

[Mamedov] This large arsenal of weapons was captured by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs during several operations. I would very much like to believe that there is no longer anyone with weapons in their posession. But unfortunately that is not the case. The other day accusations started that the internal troops opened fire on a local church.

[O.N. Tkach, platoon commander] Internal troops will never and have never opened fire on the church. What is more, our soldiers were fired on from this church.

[M.I. Zubkov, chairman of the provisional organizing bureau for Gadrut Rayon of the NKAO] In certain fields where grapes are being picked, both Armenians and Azerbaijanis are working side by side. There have been no incidents at all. No one is guarding them and they—the people—themselves say: We are tired of the guerillas who do not allow us to live in peace.

[Mamedov] There is an abundant harvest in Karabakh. Grape picking is underway. But that is here in the valley, whereas in the mountains shooting is continuing as before.

Party Control Over Armenian KGB To End

NC2709104690 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Text] Yerevan, 25 Sep (ARMENPRES)—An open party meeting took place at the republic's Committee for State Security 20-21 September. The meeting examined the measures to be taken by the party organizations at the Armenian Committee for State Security toward the process of depoliticization of the security organs.

The meeting overwhelmingly decided for the quick depoliticization of the organs of the Armenian Committee for State Security.

The collective at the Armenian Committee for State Security then adopted the following appeal addressed to the republic's Supreme Soviet:

The collective of the Armenian Committee for State Security, being aware of the importance of the democratization processes in the state and public life and of its responsibility in ensuring the security of our people, fully supports the 23 August 1990 declaration on the independence of Armenia.

In view of the prevailing situation and under conditions of multiplicity of political opinions and establishment of a multi-party system, the workers of the republic's Committee for State Security deem it necessary to quickly depoliticize the security organs; meaning by that the barring of the membership and participation of the workers of the Armenian Committee for State Security in any political party or organization during their employment, and of the activities of these formations within the organs of the republic's Committee for State Security. Hence, we request the Armenian Supreme Soviet to speed up the formulation and adoption of the relevant legislation.

Armenia Party Congress Criticizes Leadership

LD2609160190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Text] The congress of the Armenian Communist Party continues its work in Yerevan today. In debates on a political report given by the central committee, criticism has been heard directed at the CPSU leadership, especially for being inconsistent in the sphere of internal policy, for being slow in participating in the solution of economic problems, and also for underestimating the country's ethnic issues.

NKAO's Council of Trade Unions Disbanded

NC2609161790 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 22 Sep 90

[Text] In accordance with a decision adopted by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Trade Unions Presidium, the work of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] Council of Trade Unions and its Presidium has been suspended and their executive boards disbanded. The grounds for this were that the activities of the NKAO Council of Trade Unions, which were aimed at disrupting the territorial integrity of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], caused the unity of the trade unions, which were affiliated with the NKAO Council of Trade Unions, to fragment and contributed toward strengthening ethnic discord and hostility in the region.

Davtyan, chairman of the NKAO Council of Trade Unions, has been removed from his post on the grounds that he grossly violated the rules and regulations which govern the USSR trade unions, disregarded the decisions adopted by the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Trade Unions, and openly adopted nationalist and separatist positions aimed at disrupting the republic's territorial integrity.

The plenum held by the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Trade Unions expelled Davtyan from the structure of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Trade Unions Presidium. A provisional organization committee has been established to give operative guidance to the primary trade union organizations, [words indistinct], and to create the suitable conditions for holding accounting and election meetings in the NKAO trade union organs. This committee has been vested with the powers of the NKAO Council of Trade Unions.

NKAO Demonstrators Send Message to Gorbachev

NC2609200690 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 25 Sep 90

[Excerpt] The streets and squares of Stepanakert had never been so crowded, even during the unforgettable February of 1988. The city residents had also never seen such a formidable barricading of the city's administrative building by the USSR internal troops.

Today, on 25 September, all the city enterprises, construction sites, organizations, and institutions have stopped work. Classes in schools and education institutes have been canceled. The public transport is not operating and shops are closed. All the residents of Stepanakert have uniformly left their workshops and classes in order to raise one more firm protest against the arbitrary acts and illegalities committed on their lands.

Disregarding the state of emergency and the strong warnings of the military commandant, the people resumed their peaceful political action after one week to convey to the higher authorities that their patience has a limit. This message was conveyed by the placards carried at the mass demonstration that said "Down With the So-Called Republican Organizational Committee," "We Demand the Restoration of the Soviet Power in Nagorno-Karabakh," and "The People's Army Should Side With the People." These basic demands of the Armenians of NKAO so far have been adamantly disregarded by the center and the Azerbaijani leadership.

The people's deputies of the NKAO oblast and rayon soviets have sent a message to the USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. The message says:

Esteemed president, we consider it our duty to urgently inform you about the state of emergency in NKAO. Today the streets and squares in the settlements in NKAO are crowded with tens of thousands of people who want to express their indignant protest at the inhuman apartheid regime imposed on the Armenian population in NKAO. All the enterprises, establishments, organizations, educational institutes, and consumer services have stopped work for 24 hours. The political hunger strike declared by the USSR people's deputies and others, the occupation of the oblast party building by brute military force, and the 18 September protest demonstration by the people of Artsakh which (?demanded) the eviction of the so-called Organizational Committee were the (?factors) behind this action. For the last two and a half years we, the Armenians of NKAO, have been subjected to moral and physical terrorism by the Azerbaijani leadership with the permission of the central authorities. The roads are blockaded; power, fuel, and communications are denied; and the drinking water is poisoned. With such measures they want to force us to abandon the idea of national self-determination. That Azerbaijani sort of internationalism is being enforced with the assistance of the Russian boys [words indistinct]. Russia, which has been the hope and protector of the Armenians, is in your person now surrendering us to the colonialism of the Azerbaijani leadership.

While the people are peacefully demonstrating in the streets, perturbing reports are arriving about the buildup of new Azerbaijani armed formations around NKAO. It is obvious that the time has come for implementing the long-prepared plan for physically exterminating the Armenian population of the oblast and the Armenian-inhabited regions in Azerbaijan. Our people are ready to accept the fateful challenge to the duel, and you should realize that no Armenian of Artsakh will retreat and that the struggle will continue until not one of them remains alive. One thing must be absolutely clear to you: We have no intention to submit to slavery, we do not want political asylum, and we are ready to die on our lands as befits a self-respecting people. God, history, and justice have always been on the side of freedom-loving people; as such they are on the side of NKAO.

The participants in the mass political disobedience demand that you restore the soviet power in the NKAO within five days. You now have the possibility to do this which will prevent a disaster and save the country from an unavoidable disgrace. We call on you to use that possibility; otherwise you will be personally held responsible for the unforeseeable consequences, concludes the cable.

The copies of this cable have been sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Russian and Armenian Supreme Soviets. [passage omitted]

Consequences of Gas Blockade in Armenia Detailed

LD2609215490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 26 Sep 90

[Report by correspondent A. Lyubimov in Yerevan; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Viktor Ambartsumyan's political hunger strike in Moscow and protest actions in Nagorno Karabakh—all this is in connection with the abolition there of the institutions of Soviet rule with a view to setting up a subunit of the Azerbaijan republican organizing committee. Things are also not quiet on the Armenian-Azerbaijani border even though in Armenia the situation has stabilized considerably. The curfew in Yerevan, which is being organized by local authorities, is considerably more effective than the one that was imposed from outside.

A problem that remains unresolved is the blockade. On 20 August the gas supply from Russia to Armenia was cut off at the compressor station in the Kazakh Rayon center of Azerbaijan: 350 million cubic meters is a fairly considerable volume especially on the threshold of winter which is always harsh in this mountain republic. The gas blockade has also posed a political problem. The main trump card is Russian gas, and indirectly it is precisely Russia which finds itself drawn into the conflict.

In Armenia the last reserves are being used now and no one knows how the homeless in Leninakan and Spitak will survive this winter.

[G. Tataryan, general director of the "Armgazprom" production association] These four million people, cold people, are on the verge of collapse. If the children perish from the cold can you imagine how this can end?

Azeri USSR People Deputies' Appeal Detailed

NC2609155390 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 22 Sep 90

[Text] The USSR people's deputies from the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] have adopted an appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet on the forced expulsion of Azerbaijanis from Armenia. The document has been distributed to the USSR Supreme Soviet members.

The appeal noted that the Armenian nationalists and their ideologists used every means to [word indistinct] against the Armenian people, and that they systematically concealed the deliberate violation of the rights of the Azerbaijanis in Armenia, the pressure directed on them for many years, and the crimes committed against them during the past decade. Half of the more than 500,000 Azerbaijanis were either suppressed or expelled from their birthplaces as a result of the continued chauvinist policy in 1918. The forced expulsion and the suppression of the Azerbaijanis continued in 1919 and 1920. The policy of forcing the Azerbaijanis out of Armenia was supported by the move to violate their

constitutional rights and to withhold their due related to their national and cultural interests.

No sign of the national and cultural autonomy of the nearly 300,000 Azerbaijanis who lived in Armenia existed until 1988. The new stage of the genocide against the Azerbaijani people in Armenia began that year.

The USSR Supreme Soviet must make a political and moral assessment of the criminal activities against the Azerbaijani people in Armenia. We must consider the fact that if the uncontrolled situation allowed in Armenia remains unpunished, then this state of affairs will encourage disruptive forces in other parts of the country. In view of this, such an assessment is of particular importance.

Therefore, we demand that a competent commission of inquiry be established by the USSR Supreme Soviet to investigate Armenia's aggression against the Azerbaijan SSR and the acts of genocide against the Azerbaijani people in Armenia.

The full text of the appeal will be published in the press.

Mutalibov Discusses Communists' Role in Azerbaijan

PM1709103690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Sep 90 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Interview with A.N. Mutalibov, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and president of Azerbaijan, by A. Shinkin; place and date not given: "Why the Republic Needs a Communist Party"—first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] It is probably no exaggeration to say that Ayaz Niyazovich Mutalibov became first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee at a tragic time for the republic, at that very moment when the life of the people and the activity of the party organization seemed to separate after the well-known events of January 1990 in Baku, heading in different directions like two diverging streams and all the bridges linking them collapsed.

The question at that time was: Which leader was capable of regaining the people's trust and thus of stabilizing the situation and removing the centers of tension? The choice fell on A.N. Mutalibov, chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers. With good reason too. He was experienced in both economic and political work. Besides that, in the opinion of many, people were won over by his purely human qualities: his composure, principled nature, and ability to look beyond the decisions being adopted to see people's interests....

Naturally the conversation with A.N. Mutalibov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and president of the republic, centered on the current situation in the region.

[Shinkin] Ayaz Niyazovich, it is less than a year since you became head of the republic's party organization. Those were critical times. Has the situation changed? What role are Communists playing in Azerbaijan's social life now?

[Mutalibov] The situation? It is hard to say anything definite on that. The situation in the republic remains complex although the thousands-strong rallies and strikes have stopped, for example. But the confusion in our people's hearts remains. Social problems have been compounded by interethnic problems. All this creates an explosive situation in which false appeals and slogans flourish. Emotions could overwhelm reason at any moment.

Does the party organization bear the blame for this, you will ask? Undoubtedly. But to be precise and completely honest, all the problems stemmed from the republic's party leadership. On their prompting, the blather of triumphal reports was used to conceal our backwardness in socioeconomic development, they promised the people one thing but did another. Patience was exhausted. The people voiced their distrust....

Then, for the first time perhaps, the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee analyzed the events of recent years and came to the conclusion that the republic's party organization is not ready for renewal or radical transformations and does not know how to act in the framework of political pluralism or find solutions appropriate to the prevailing situation. Then we began facing up to real life.

Of course we have not achieved much yet. But what we have done is encouraging. We are convinced that despite the mistakes that were made, the republic's Communist Party remains the only consolidating force in the republic in terms of its political experience, intellectual potential, organization, and influence in society. Figuratively speaking, it is the yeast without which the layer of political civilization of a democratic society cannot form and develop in our country.

[Shinkin] However that yeast must have an active medium, I think. So get out and about—there is nothing to be gained from staying in your offices.

[Mutalibov] If you are talking about the party apparatus, it is a long time since it sat around in the office, everyone has realized that this is not the time for that now. They see the strength of their influence not in vertical links but in work with primary organizations because that is where their saviours and helpers are now. Of course this reorientation process is complex. After all it is one thing to order and another to persuade, to look people in the eye, and answer their awkward questions. Apart from knowledge it also takes a psychological breakthrough.

I think that the further democratization of internal party relations will also be served by putting party and soviet workers on the party register of primary organizations. This process has already begun. For the first time,

perhaps, we have stopped forming party committees, including the Central Committee, on the ex-officio principle. The nomenklatura is being reduced. Increasingly cadre promotions often are made from a number of alternative candidates. This makes it possible to promote real leaders rather than people from this or that circle.

There is another important factor. Party committees are now switching the emphasis of work increasingly to residential districts. That is, those places where we are losing out to our opponents increasingly often. In a number of places, for example, we are creating party organizations uniting Communists on the local neighborhood principle and councils of secretaries from the primary organizations of residential districts. No party is worth anything without the support of the people's masses. It seems that everyone has grasped this simple truth.

[Shinkin] Did the 28th party congress introduce anything new into this work? And what do you think about its results, Ayaz Niyazovich?

[Mutalibov] Judging from the press, the assessments of the party congress varied greatly. No wonder. After all, the congress itself was dominated by the spirit of different approaches, judgments, and positions. And I experienced for myself the incredible confrontation that they sometimes produced when I chaired one of its sittings. There were times when every speaker considered his particular problem to be the ultimate truth. Today too, of course, many people view the Communist forum from the standpoint of their own ambitions either satisfied or most often unsatisfied.

I personally think that the congress convincingly showed the CPSU's ability to restructure itself, to integrate new ideas, and to radically change internal party democracy.

The congress decisions helped the republic's Communists to elaborate their own operational tactics. Yes, we acknowledge the CPSU Statutes and Program. Now that we have begun to elaborate our own draft documents however, we are taking into account the specific conditions of the republic: national, territorial, economic, and so forth. They must incorporate existing experience, and take into account past mistakes and omissions as well as the republic's geopolitical uniqueness and social development level. Our Communist Party cannot count on understanding and support of the people if it goes on imitating the policy of the center.

There is nothing terrible in that, either. Remember, Lenin in his brief letter to Communists of the Caucasian republics said three times that it was necessary not to slavishly imitate the party's tactics but to "change them thoughtfully in the light of specific conditions." The only pity is that we did not heed Lenin's advice for long. Life has shown that you cannot wear someone else's caftan.

[Shinkin] But are we not repeating the old mistakes? After all, you are first secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and president of the republic as well. Is this not the same old attempt to make the party caftan fit the soviets? The attitude of the fairly broad masses to this is, to put it mildly, one of alarm.

[Mutalibov] Does it not seem to you that people's opinions on this question are influenced by old-fashioned notions about the party? We are not living in 1937, Allah be praised, but in 1990. Actually M.S. Gorbachev answered this question at the congress. He stated firmly then that he was occupying one chair. And it must be understood, I think, that this was the chair of the leader of the restructuring of the country.

There must be no wishful thinking. However much people shout "Power to the soviets!" there is an objective reality as well. It is this: The present soviets still do not have the organizational mechanisms of power. The legal and financial basis of their activity is still being created. Furthermore, parasitism has not been eradicated from all their workers by any means. There is a shortage of experienced and resourceful cadres. In my view, combining posts in this situation makes it possible to avoid confrontation between soviet and party organs and to pool the efforts of the two structures for the fulfillment of the goals set. But some people, however, would very much like to present this as a usurping of power, although they are well aware that even in nature every fruit has its time and before that time it is inedible.

Incidentally, soon we are going to have soviet elections here. The republic's Communist Party wants them to be a lesson in honest competition between representatives of all strata of society and social organizations and movements. May the best man win. And to that end we will seek to observe the equal rights of all candidates and not permit diktat or pressure from any source.

If we manage to achieve that it means that we will be laying the foundations of a parliamentary system in our country. We will be forming an active intellectual corps of deputies representing the interests of all the republic's inhabitants. Judging by the work of soviets in other regions, we will of course not be spared the excesses of the present culture of democracy. But I pin special hopes on the work of Communist deputies whose political experience may give the necessary stability and strength of common sense.

[Shinkin] Politics is conducted through people, as we know. In the republic today, it must be admitted that the Communist Party has effectively lost its monopoly of power over people's minds. As everywhere else so in Azerbaijan social formations with their own programs and slogans are operating. The question then is this: Who is going to win...?

[Mutalibov] Yes, a good question. But in my view the question should be put differently: Win for what purpose? Everyone here knows that dozens of parties, social formations, and groupings have sprung up in our

republic. The Communist Party has no desire or wish to enter into confrontation with them. On the contrary, the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress reaffirmed our readiness for constructive dialogue and cooperation with all new social organizations which observe the constitution and the laws of the republic and are oriented toward a socialist choice and national accord.

With the Communist Party's participation a democratic congress has been formed within whose framework there are lively discussions and an exchange of opinions on the problems troubling society. Special hopes are pinned on the Consultative Council created under the republic's Supreme Soviet. But unfortunately its work has gotten bogged down. Experience shows that merely wanting to find a form for cooperation is not enough. Accord presupposes a rapprochement of positions on the basic questions, too. That is what is lacking.

We have different understandings of the attainment of economic sovereignty, for example, and most important, diametrically opposed approaches to the vision of the republic's future and its sociopolitical development paths. Instead of arguments they sometimes present us with ultimatums and threats of strikes and boycotts. The methods of diktat are not the best road to pluralism. However, some newly fledged leaders want to take advantage of the difficulties in the republic, and to be honest, of our mistakes to sow discord and deliberately work toward destabilization with no concern for the consequences. When you come across such phenomena you can clearly see that the struggle is being waged not for the interests of the people, whose living standard is among the lowest, but in order to seize power.

[Shinkin] And when it comes to economic prosperity, Ayaz Niyazovich, what does the republic's Communist Party offer its people?

[Mutalibov] We do not intend to copy the Union directives. We are now working out a program of gradual, phased movement toward the market with clearly defined priorities in each of them.

One area is the attraction of foreign capital because the capitalist countries' interest in the Azerbaijan market is great. Well-known firms in the United States, Japan, and Italy are ready to create joint ventures. Recently, for example, a group of our specialists signed a contract for the creation of a Soviet-Italian joint venture for the production of prefabricated houses. The first international congress of representatives of foreign business circles interested in economic ties with the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] is going to be held in Baku soon.

We are also most attentively studying means of integration with the economies of all the Union republics without which market relations are inconceivable in our country.

All these are questions of the tactics of the transition to the market, but the main one which the Communist Party Central Committee defends is to ensure the social protection of the republic's inhabitants and to prevent a significant lowering of their living standard. After all, over one-third of the population is living on the poverty line.

[Shinkin] But is martial law an obstacle to your plans? After all, you can do anything with bayonets except sit on them.

[Mutalibov] You have touched on a sore point of mine. I have noticed myself how the psychology of the Baku people has changed since the imposition of martial law in the city. People lead withdrawn and joyless lives. Instead of the customary amicability you most often come across irritability. But on the other hand, while passions and emotions are seething, how else can you normalize the situation?

Here, I think, we need to begin from the prime cause—interethnic conflict with Armenia. So long as that exists the situation will be unpredictable. But it would not take much to settle the question. In the first place, our neighbors must abandon the idea of removing Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast from our republic. And second, there must be a full disarmament of the unconstitutional armed formations whose actions are viewed in our republic with tremendous indignation and unease. The well-known decree of the USSR president creates good preconditions for the solution of this task.

The Azerbaijan SSR in turn is ready to settle the conflict on a constitutional and political basis. There is no alternative here. The government also guarantees to safeguard and develop all the principles of autonomy, security, equal rights, and freedom of all citizens living on its territory. It seems to me that it is time for all the politicians, or those people who are trying to perform that role, to stop plunging the peoples into strife and suffering. History has already shown many times: No good will come of it. Rather, this could have nothing but the worst consequences.

[Shinkin] As someone who holds three high offices, what do you think about your role in the life of the republic's Communist Party?

[Mutalibov] Sadly our wishes do not always come true. But I sincerely want the renewal of our Communist Party and the revival of its prestige among the people. And I will do everything to create a program of national development on whose basis Communists will pursue a political line in the sphere of state, socioeconomic, and cultural building. But having established truly democratic relations within the Communist Party, we will be able to ensure pluralism and political accord in the republic's social life. After all, to talk about a real improvement of matters in Azerbaijan today without a strong and active Communist Party is a joke, to say the least.